



*The Bancroft Library*

University of California • Berkeley







Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2007 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation



# PRESIDENCY AND PRIESTHOOD.

---

## THE APOSTASY, REFORMATION, AND RESTORATION.

BY  
ELDER WM. H. KELLEY.

---

LAMONI, IOWA:  
HERALD PUBLISHING HOUSE AND BOOKBINDERY.  
1908

*Copyright,*

1890

BY WILLIAM H. KELLEY.

THE BACCHETT LIBRARY


F835

.715

24

1908

A-V. ROBINSON



ELDER WILLIAM H. KELLEY.



## PREFACE.

---

THIS book is a revision and enlargement of the article published some years ago under the title of "Presidency and Priesthood." Its revision and republication were authorized by an act of the General Conference. It is published with a view of meeting a present need, and to call attention to some of the most important considerations that enter into theological discourse and church building.

The priesthood being the foundation of the authorized system of worship in the old dispensation, its proper place is sought to be assigned to it in the new ; and the Church of Christ is presented in striking contrast to all other systems of worship, in its authority, organization, and doctrine, with the view of inciting inquiry in the truth-seeker, putting him in the right path, and encouraging investigation in the thoughtful everywhere. The apostasy and reformation are necessarily considered in connection with the restoration. No apology is due for the ungarnished manner in which the wrong is arraigned and the right vindicated. It is truth only

that is sought. If we have it not, let others, more fortunate, point out the errors. We are in the line of the march of ideas and progress, and say, in the broadest liberality and complete freedom of inquiry, "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." We confidently believe that the "latter-day glory" has dawned, and the "dispensation of the fulness of times" has been ushered in, and that all the inhabitants of the world are called upon to give ear. "Hear ye." The cardinal principles of the faith are set forth, and those usually assailed by opponents are discussed at length. It is definitive, aggressive, and defensive. After an extensive research, the author has been compelled to assume some new positions, at variance with the old school or notions, and these, of course, are to be tried by the test of time and criticism. Since the appearance of the original article, others have expressed the belief that "James, the Lord's brother, succeeded to the presidency of the church at Jerusalem, soon after the crucifixion of the Saviour." In order for convenience, and to render the work as authoritative and useful as may be, references are given to nearly all of the citations, from both sacred and profane history. Some subjects should have been more elaborately presented, but what is written will at least suggest thought, and the reader can extend his inquiry at will. On the sub-

ject of archæological researches, space would not permit the extended investigation desired for it.

Indeed, evidences on that subject bearing upon the question considered are almost limitless. The appended history will be found a convenience, and will also incite thought in the right direction. Infallibility is not claimed for this work. It is handed out to take its chances among readers and critics, believing that it possesses sufficient merit to commend itself. Elder C. Scott rendered suggestive aid in this revision, which is credited with pleasure. I also commend the reading of "Romanism and the Republic," by Rev. Isaac J. Lansing, A. M., as a book of merit and suited to the times. Submitted in the interest of progress, free investigation, and fact, with the view of asserting exact Bible truth and the indorsement of the highest conditions manifest for the exaltation and salvation of man.

WM. H. KELLEY.



## PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

---

The ready sale of the first issue of "Presidency and Priesthood," and the commendations it has received from those best qualified to judge of its merits and need, is a sufficient assurance to print a second edition, being thus encouraged in the thought that it will exert an influence for good wherever read. It speaks for itself, and should be read and reread together with a careful examination and reference to the Bible.

Some additional matter of importance has been introduced in this edition, bearing upon some of the most intricate subjects discussed, which makes it of increased value to the reader. Also, the autograph and likeness of the author is inserted as a frontispiece at the request of friends, and some errors have been corrected that incidentally occurred in the first edition.

Thanks are due to many for their favorable notice of the book, and friendly criticisms and suggestions, made with a view to improvement, or to test some of the positions taken. So far, it has stood the test of examination, and is still open to criticism; the author believing that this is a big world of ours, and that it is laden with facts of interest and worth to all men, some of which are known and others lie on the way, and that no trammelled lines of thought and inquiry by creed, illiberality, intolerance, unfairness, or a fear of coming to the light, will manifest them. The Christian, above all others, should be the last one to be creed-bound, intolerant, selfish,

and non-progressive. The solemn injunction, "As ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them," is upon him; and he is no Christian who is unfair, intolerant, and a hater of others.

This is not a book of flattery and compliments, to feed the vanity of any, but it treats of institutions and things in the light of facts, and men in the same way, when necessarily considered as connected with great associations and movements in their time. It is sought to get at the bed-rock of things, especially that relating to the religious world, with the thought in view that men should walk by the light of the very highest possible attainments in life.

Commended in the interest of truth and progress.

WM. H. KELLEY.

## INTRODUCTION.

It is thought advisable that, in the publication of the second edition of "Presidency and Priesthood," an introductory chapter be inserted as an aid to the reader, in more readily determining the subject-matter in hand. It should be borne in mind that this book is intended to instruct rather than to amuse, — to impart valuable information and stimulate Biblical criticism, rather than to be idly read for pastime and present gratification and pleasure. It is a means to an end, a key to the solving of many vexed questions of theological controversies, and the understanding of the Bible and the various religious sects and denominations extant.

The religious world is presented before the reader as in a mirror, before an open Bible, viewed in the light and demands of the times. The investigator will become more and more interested as he peruses the volume, and both the learned and the unlearned may read it with refreshing interest and profit. The first chapters are said to be least attractive to the casual reader, or those who have not thought extensively upon the subjects discussed; yet they are necessary to the full understanding of the matter presented, so the reader may push on hopefully, with the assurance that more attractive pages are fast crowding upon him.

This is an age of book-making, agitation, and thought; and "Presidency and Priesthood" adds one more volume to the many, and whoever carefully reads it will be amply rewarded for his time and effort. The commendations, from those competent of judging, amply sustain this seemingly flattering statement. It is intended to aid one in the exam-

ination of his own, as well as the faith of others, that he may be the better prepared to give "an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear." (1 Peter iii. 15.) Said St. Paul, "Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves." (2 Cor. xiii. 5.)

The subjects of paramount importance discussed are, the administrative authority in revealed religion, or the priesthoods upon which rested the systems of faith and worship both under the old and new covenants, or the church under Moses, and that under Christ. Their respective origins and distinctive characteristics, in organization, doctrine, ethics, spirit, etc., are discussed at length; especially is the church of Christ, as set forth in the New Testament, with its distinctive authority, organization, and system of worship, held out as the ideal church, and put in contrast with all others, with a view of more easily determining the true order of worship.

The question of authority and right is of first consideration in all governments, whether religious or civil. All institutions, of whatever name, must be clothed with an administrative authority and constitutional right, in order to achieve success. Upon what does this or that organization rest, whether of church or State, are questions of the highest importance. Whence the authority in the State and whence that in religion, have always been questions of great moment and deep solicitude among men.

To illustrate, I will use our own government, as it is most familiar. It is founded upon the suffrage of the people. Every citizen is a crowned king. What the people elect is binding and cannot be changed. Their voice is the authority of the government, the constitution and laws. What they approve is in force, and what they forbid is prohibited. By common consent, the authority resident in the people is



delegated and concentrated for practical ends in the government, which is regulated by the constitution and laws. Thus provision is made for the establishment of the government, its administration and perpetuity. But every citizen is not an officer, a qualified administrator of the law, whatever other rights and privileges he may enjoy. Persons who are elected or appointed to fill the various stations or offices in the government are its only representatives, those who can speak in its name,—and none others can. In point of authority and office, the officer is greater than the citizen. Hence, the President, Vice-President, judges, secretaries, representatives, etc., are empowered to do what the mere citizen cannot do; and, without this authorization, the efforts of the most gifted and astute of men would be but presumptuous and futile. It is also true that every ambassador to a foreign court must be duly authorized by the government, before speaking in its name or transacting business for it; and all persons of foreign birth are aliens to the government of the United States. Hence, no Frenchman, Englishman, Russian, German, Turk, Persian, or what not, can be a citizen of the United States, except he complies fully with the laws enacted by which he may be made such, administered by an authorized agent of the government, who may speak in its name.

Further, a foreigner might apply for citizenship and comply perfectly with all the forms of the law, take the oath of allegiance administered by one of the most learned and capable of men; and yet, if the authority to act did not reside in said administrator, the whole transaction would be invalid and worthless. It would not bind the government. The foreigner is still a foreigner. He has simply been imposed upon. It matters not how honest of purpose and innocent of intention he may have been, or how much confidence he imposed in the one who administered the oath and

gave him his papers, nor how much money he paid for the services rendered ; he has simply been imposed upon. He is yet an alien. If he desires citizenship, he must yet go to a competent officer of the government, and be duly initiated, or forever remain a foreigner. Even an ordinary instrument of writing, such as a bond, deed, mortgage, marriage certificate, etc., must be executed by an officer duly authorized under the laws to perform said acts, or they are of no value. They may be made out according to due forms of law, but even then it is necessary that they bear the signature of a properly appointed magistrate, in order that they may be valid.

What is true in this respect of the State is true also concerning the church, except it be in regard to the source from whence the authority is derived, that of the State originating with the people and that of the church with God ; so, without divine appointment and authorization, no church has a just claim upon the conscience of the people. They must know that God authorized and approves their system of worship, in order to inspire within them faith and reverence for it. This was true under the old covenant. God descended upon Mount Sinai in burning fire, and from out of the thick cloud and thunderings and lightnings, the trembling of the earth and sound of the trumpet, the voice of the unseen King was heard uttering the divine mandates. Israel stood still, wrapped in awe and reverence. "Moses spake, and God answered him by a voice." The people heard. Under the superlative grandeur and majesty of this scene every Israelite was made to know that the seal of Jehovah was upon his religion, and that God was with Moses. For the authorization and establishment of the religious services, the Lord said unto Moses, "Take thou unto thee Aaron thy brother, and his sons with him, from among the children of Israel, that he may minister unto me in the priest's office,

even Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, Eleazer and Ithamar, Aaron's sons." (Ex. xxviii. 1.) They were consecrated to an "everlasting priesthood throughout their generations." (Ex. x. 15.) The organization took form in the offices of the priesthood, which was the administrative authority of the constituted service, and a whole tribe was set apart as administrators. The Aaronic or Levitical priesthood was the authority to which every officer was consecrated, and by which he was authorized to act in the name of God and the people, without which their acts were mere presumption, to be met with reprimand and rejection. God was the author of the service, and selected men to serve, and authorized them to speak in his name.

A similar exhibition of infallible proofs of certainty and divine appointment and authority obtained under the new covenant by Christ. A new priesthood and a new order of worship required to be established by the same divine hand, that it might have a proper claim upon the people; for a religion without God in it is no religion, naught but glittering show, to end in disappointment to its devotees. Hence the announcement made by John the Baptist, "Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," challenged the consideration of the people and the existing order of things in his time among the sects, as did the thunders of Sinai that of Israel in the wilderness.

Old customs, traditions, and usages were drawing to a close, notwithstanding they were firmly embedded in the affections of the people. "The baptism of John, whence was it? from heaven, or of men?" (Matt. xxi. 25) was of chief importance to the people. It was the question of questions. In this age the answer is easily given from the New Testament, in the language, "There was a man sent from God, whose name was John," but in its first announcement that answer was not accepted by the religious leaders.

Under the old covenant, the voice of God was heard from the burning, frowning, cloudy top of Sinai. But under the new, with its message of peace and glad tidings to all men, it was said to John in the silent shades of the wilderness to "go preach and baptize." "And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him. And I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said to me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God." (John i. 32-34.)

Upon the peaceful plains of Bethlehem, angels chanted the coming of the new-born King. "I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord." (Luke ii. 10, 11.)

In baptism, down upon the shores of the restive Jordan, the voice of God was heard: "This is my beloved Son." Again, "Hear ye him." God speaking from a higher altitude than Sinai, out of heaven itself. This King Immanuel announced, "I come down from heaven, not to do my own will, but the will of him that sent me." (John vi. 38.) "The Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say and what I should speak. And I know that his commandment is life everlasting." (John xii. 49, 50.)

That all the world might be placed under reasonable obligations to obey this message, by an appeal to judgment, conscience, affection, and faith, Jesus said, "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me. If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself." (John vii. 16, 17.) Again, "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever." (John xiv. 16.) This was to

be the God in man, the seal of divine approval. So it is written, "The promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." (Acts ii. 39.) "Ye may all prophesy one by one." This divine recognition was to abide with the believer always.

This new service under the second Moses took the place of the old, bringing the people not as "unto the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire," but "unto Mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels."

"To the general assembly and church of the first-born, which are written in heaven," etc. (Heb. xii. 18-23.) Jesus, as the mediator of this new covenant, based upon better promises than the old, was made a high priest after the order of Melchisedek, was in his similitude. He announced, "I will build my church." The organization took form in the offices of the high priesthood, not in the Levitical as under Moses, with priests and Levites, but that of the Melchisedek, with apostles and prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers, etc., as the chief administrators, Jesus himself being "the apostle and high priest." He clothed his ministry with this authority, and commanded them to speak "in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost"; gave them the "keys of the kingdom," and power to bind and loose under his seal. The complete organization was to be built up a "spiritual house and an holy priesthood."

The great world stood to this new church in the light of foreigners and aliens. Men were received into it by obeying its established laws of initiation, or were "translated into the kingdom of his dear Son" by those appointed administrators. (Col. i. 13.) So Paul wrote, "Now we are ambassadors for Christ." The new subjects received were entitled to all of the rights and privileges of the older citi-

zens — “the seal of their adoption” — communion with God. So the authorized agents “went forth and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following.” (Mark xvi. 20.)

When one set of officers ceased, by death or otherwise, their places were filled by others by divine designation. So Paul wrote, “As the Lord hath called every one, so let him walk. And so ordain I in all the churches.” (1 Cor. vii. 17.) “For how shall they preach, except they be sent?” (Rom. x. 15.)

Thus the church was represented by its accredited agents. The first officers were not intended to remain always in the church as its administrators, no more than it was intended that the first officers appointed in the civil government should remain as its perpetual servants. In either case, a proper appointment and commission was necessary, in case of death or removal, in order that the government might be perpetuated and the transactions be with authority and legal right. So Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, and others have had their successors in the civil government; and it was intended that the apostles, prophets, etc., should have theirs in the ecclesiastical government.


All foreigners were received into the church by obeying the laws of adoption administered by its authorized agents, who were entitled to speak and act in the name of Jesus Christ; otherwise, their acts were assumptive and invalid, and God would not confirm the transactions by the seal of his favor. Did any one desire to unite with the church and conform perfectly to the laws of adoption, and the administrations were performed by one not authorized to act or administer, the transaction was held to be invalid. The party was yet an alien, and needed to go and be duly inducted by a competent officer, — no matter how learned the man who assumed to perform the act unauthorized, nor how

much he was paid for his service, — if he would become a citizen and attain to the privileges and excellences promised by the heavenly King to citizens. Such was the recognized authority and order of the New Testament church.

It is intended, also, to show in this volume that the Church established at Jerusalem, and the system of worship then set up, grew and flourished for a season. That there was in after years a corruption, decline, and a departure from the faith. That another system of worship arose, unlike it, which assumed to take its place, called in prophecy the “Man of Sin.” This made possible the various existing sects or denominations; and their origin, distinctive characteristics, and relation to each other and the primitive church, are discussed at length in this book, and their respective claims to authority and how they obtained it set forth.

Also, the rise of the church of prophecy in the restoration of the gospel to be established in the last days previous to the second coming of the Saviour is set forth, with a dissertation upon the twenty-ninth chapter of Isaiah and the revealment of the “sealed book” therein mentioned; with the archaeological and Biblical evidences regarding the earliest inhabitants of the American continent, their past and future, together with the Jews, the land of Palestine, and the Israelitish and Egyptian origin of the progenitors of the American Indians; their civilization, knowledge, and high attainments in the arts and sciences, religion, etc., with facsimiles of their manner of writing, and other history and matters of interest to every investigator and searcher for truth. Tell things as they are, is the motto of this book, without flattery or favor to any, whether powerful and influential, or weak and inconsiderate.

We are compelled to meet things as they are, not as we would like to have them; and the counsel worthy the highest consideration is, “Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.” (Paul.)





# CONTENTS.

---

	PAGE
<b>CHAPTER I.</b> . . . . .	1
<p>The Priesthood defined. — Its Antiquity. — It is known under two heads, that of the Melchisedec and the Aaronic Priesthoods. — One called after the name of Melchisedec, the other after Aaron. — The Aaronic administered the Law, the Melchisedec the Gospel.</p>	
<b>CHAPTER II.</b> . . . . .	7
<p>The Unchangeability of Deity. — Antiquity of the Gospel. — The Melchisedec and the Aaronic Priesthoods were conferred upon the Ministry in the Time of Moses.</p>	
<b>CHAPTER III.</b> . . . . .	16
<p>Positions in the Priesthood cannot be assumed with Impunity. — The Melchisedec and the Aaronic Priesthoods were conferred upon the Christian Ministry.</p>	
<b>CHAPTER IV.</b> . . . . .	30
<p>The Change of the Levitical Priesthood from Duties under the Law to Services in the Gospel System. — It is inferior to the Melchisedec Priesthood. — The Offices in the Priesthood are Perpetual, the Occupants Transitory. — They were filled by Divine Appointment in the Christian Dispensation. — Provision in the Priesthood for Apostles, Seventies, High Priests, Prophets, Elders, Bishops, Priests, Teachers, and Deacons. — The New Testament the Standard or Test by which all Religious Denominations should be tried, and those found not to be in Harmony with this Pattern should be rejected.</p>	
<b>CHAPTER V.</b> . . . . .	51
<p>The Office of the Chief Apostle and High Priest the superior one in the Church. — Jesus filled this Office in the Church while on Earth. — He was succeeded, after his Ascension into Heaven, by James, the Lord's brother.</p>	

	PAGE
CHAPTER VI. . . . .	67
The President of the Church continued. — He had two Counsellors, most likely Jude and Silas, or Judas. — James, the Son of Zebedee, Peter, and John were not constituted a First Presidency over the Entire Church. — Peter the President of the Twelve Apostles. — The Cardinal Principles of the Faith. — The Laws of Initiation into the Church.	
CHAPTER VII. . . . .	85
The Virgin Church. — The Rise and Prevalence of the Man of Sin, or Mystery, Babylon.	
CHAPTER VIII. . . . .	106
The Reformation. — Protestant Churches, namely, Lutheran, Calvinist, Presbyterian, Episcopalian, Baptist. — The latter's Claims to Transmitted Authority.	
CHAPTER IX. . . . .	157
John Wesley and the Methodist Church. — Friends or Quakers. — Congregationalists. — Disciples or Campbellites. — The Policies of both Roman Catholics and Protestants Pacific when Law forbids Proscription. — The Spirit of Old Persecutions assumes a Mild Form.	
CHAPTER X. . . . .	193
Joseph Smith, Jr., and the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints.	
CHAPTER XI. . . . .	252
Modern Scientific Disclosures corroborate the Statements of Joseph Smith, Jr., that the Characters submitted by him and Martin Harris to the Inspection of Dr. Mitchell and Prof. Anthon, of New York City, were true ones, and were copied from the Records of the Ancient Inhabitants of America, as affirmed and testified to by him and others. •	
CHAPTER XII. . . . .	294
The Testimony of numerous Authors.	





# PRESIDENCY AND PRIESTHOOD.

---

## CHAPTER I.

**THE PRIESTHOOD DEFINED.—ITS ANTIQUITY.—IT IS KNOWN UNDER TWO HEADS, THAT OF THE MELCHISEDEC AND THE AARONIC PRIESTHOODS.—ONE CALLED AFTER THE NAME OF MELCHISEDEC, THE OTHER AFTER AARON.—THE AARONIC ADMINISTERED THE LAW, THE MELCHISEDEC THE GOSPEL.**

**PRIESTHOOD.—What is it? Webster defines it to be,**

"1. The office or character of a priest."

"2. The order of men set apart for sacred offices."

More fully defined, priesthood on earth is the authority and order of God committed unto men, by which they are duly empowered and commissioned to preach the gospel and administer the ordinances thereof; namely, to baptize, lay on hands, bless, administer the Lord's supper, ordain, and perform any and all other duties required in the administration of the government of His church or kingdom among men.

It was conferred upon men as early as Cain and Abel; hence it is as old, at least, as the race of man.

The offices of the priesthood are varied, bear distinctive names, and are made continuous. The occupants may be removed, but the offices remain, having been fixed by the hand of Deity.

Those permitted to hold these several positions take the name of the office to which they are respectively assigned, not the office the names of the persons.

No one can rightly assume to act in the offices of the priesthood until he is duly appointed by the great Author of the institution, and complies perfectly with the laws and usages governing such appointments.

The Scriptures reveal a priesthood and a connected line of priests, clearly set out, all the way back from the apostles to Aaron, which is traceable through the Levites. This is called the Aaronic priesthood, but it did not originate with Aaron, or in his day, neither was it prepared for him, but he for it. (See Ex. xxviii. 1.) God said unto Moses, "Take Aaron thy brother, and his sons with him, from among the children of Israel, that he may minister unto me in the priest's office." An office already extant, and in waiting for an occupant. (See also Ex. xix. 23, 24.)

A chief duty of this office was to offer a lamb upon the altar, which was a type of the sacrifice of the Son of God. Cain and Abel were commanded to obey this rule. (Gen. iv. 3, 4.) They brought offerings before the Lord for a sacrifice, which clearly proves that the authority of the priesthood and the office of a priest were vested in some one at that time. "The Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering."

To argue that the Aaronic priesthood came into existence in the time of Aaron simply because it bears his name, would be to assume that the high priesthood originated with Melchisedec because it bears his name.

Admitting this for the argument, will some one tell us by what authority men administered at the altar before the time of Melchisedec, by which Abel offered an "acceptable offering," and Noah officiated as a priest? If men could properly administer before the Lord in olden times without the authority of either the Melchisedec or the Aaronic priesthoods, why was the use of either established? The admission that God has at any time committed the priesthood as a means of authorizing men to administer before him acceptably, must be taken as positive evidence of its necessity.

The inspired records clearly reveal and provide for the existence of two priesthoods, viz., the Melchisedec and the Aaronic. Under one or both of these the government of God was administered from Abel to Christ, each priesthood having its separate and specific duties assigned.

That the Melchisedec priesthood was extant as early as the time of Abraham is shown from Genesis xiv. 18, 19, as follows :—

"And Melchisedec king of Salem brought forth bread and wine: and he was the priest of the most high God. And he blessed him, and said, Blessed be Abram of the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth."

"He blessed him that had the promises." — Heb. vii. 6.

That priesthood has neither descent, "beginning of days, or end of life." It was before Melchisedec. Priests of that order are "made like unto the Son of God; abideth a priest continually." (Heb. vii. 3.) After the time of Melchisedec the high priesthood was called by his name instead of by its former title, evi-

dently because Melchisedec was a noted and a very worthy high priest; and the lesser priesthood was called after the name of Aaron, because he also was such a distinguished high priest of that order. These two priesthoods were conferred upon men, in the ages that are past, as a means of authorizing them to administer acceptably in the government of God. Their duties were separate and distinct. Those of the Aaronic priesthood are clearly and definitely set out. (See Ex. xxviii. 29; Lev. viii.; Ex. xxx. 17+21; Lev. x. 9; xxi. 7-14; vi. 12; 2 Chron. xiii. 11; Num. iv. 5-15; xviii. 26-28; Lev. x. 11; Deut. xxx. 10, etc.)

Paul, in writing of this priesthood, says: —

“And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins.” — Heb. x. 11. “If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood (for under it the people received the law), what further need was there that another priest should rise after the order of Melchisedec, and not be called after the order of Aaron?” — Heb. vii. 11.

This shows a distinction in the two priesthoods, the Melchisedec being the greater. The “law of carnal ordinances” was administered by the Aaronic priesthood. It did not “make the comers thereunto perfect.” Priests of that order were made “after the law of a carnal commandment,” — this phrase expresses simply the rites and ceremonies of the Mosaic institutions that were “added because of transgressions,” and which were not a necessary part of the gospel (Gal. iii. 19), — and “were not suffered to continue by reason of death.”



(Heb. vii. 16, 18, 19, 23 ; x. 9, 10, 11, 12 ; Gal. ii. 16 ; Acts xiii. 39 ; Rom. iii. 20, 21, 28, and viii. 3 ; Eph. ii. 5 ; Col. ii. 20, etc.)

This is to argue that the Melchisedec priesthood administered a higher code, a more perfect system than did that of Aaron. Priests of this order were made "like unto the Son of God ; abideth a priest continually." (Heb. vii. 3.) Made "after the power of an endless life." (Heb. vii. 16.) What was this higher and more perfect code or system that required the authority of the Melchisedec priesthood for its administration? It was evidently the gospel : for James presents the gospel as "the perfect law of liberty." (i. 25.) Again, a "royal law." (ii. 28.) This is the system through which perfection may be secured to the believers, "as pertaining to the conscience." It converts the soul, makes wise the simple. (Ps. xix. 4.) In short, "It is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." (Rom. i. 16.)

What authority administers this perfect code? A law would be a nullity without some power to administer it. The "law of Moses," the "schoolmaster," which brought "death," was administered by the Aaronic priesthood : it follows, then, that "the royal law," the "perfect law of liberty," the gospel, is administered by the authority of the Melchisedec priesthood. This will account for its having been reinstated in the time of our Saviour's personal ministry among men. Moses' law was to be done away and the gospel reinstated. The "glad tidings of great joy," the immutable laws of life, were to be preached in all the world ; and of neces-

sity it required the unchangeable priesthood to administer it, as in days of old.

If the Melchisedec priesthood is not the one by which the gospel should be preached and its laws administered, why did God introduce and authorize men to work by it in the time of the Saviour? If the gospel could have been properly preached and administered without it, why was its use established? If Christ and his ministry were empowered with this priesthood as an essential means of presenting the gospel system, who shall be so presumptuous as to affirm that the gospel can be acceptably administered without it in any age? To argue that it can is to charge Deity with instituting a non-essential—something of no worth. The priesthood was not limited to a given time and then to cease, but was to be continued with the true order of worship. It was transmitted from Abel to Noah through the people denominated "Sons of God." (Gen. vi. 2; Job i. 6.) By him it was brought across the flood (Gen. vii. 20) and remained with his descendants so long as they continued in the true order of worship. It belonged of right to Abraham, who was a descendant from Noah through Shem. (Gen. xi. 1.) He builded an altar in Canaan. (Gen. xii. 8; xiii. 4.) Melchizedek held the high priesthood at this time, who had received it from his predecessors. It also remained among men until Moses, for Moses' father-in-law, a Canaanite, seems to have held the true priesthood and worshipped the true God. (Ex. xviii.) "We agree," say Doctors Smith and Cheatham, "with the Jewish tradition, that Adam was the first priest." Isaac and Jacob were priests, also. (Gen. xxvi. 25.)

## CHAPTER II.

THE UNCHANGEABILITY OF DEITY. — ANTIQUITY OF THE GOSPEL. —  
THE MELCHISEDEC AND THE AARONIC PRIESTHOODS WERE  
CONFERRED UPON THE MINISTRY IN THE TIME OF MOSES.

THE Holy Scriptures teach that God's ways are "equal"; that he changes not. (Ez. xviii. 25, 29; Mal. iii. 6.) This being true, and he has ordained a means of salvation, a plan, a system, and a power for its administration, at any time or place, then that is his plan to-day; otherwise, he has *changed* his once declared plan or system. If it has been changed, where is the law revealing the change? What is the plan now? Did he introduce this last one? If he did not, who did? Does the one extant now resemble the ancient one? All of these are legitimate, suggestive inquiries that naturally arise in a reflective mind, and they are entitled to an answer.

But some one will say that "the Melchisedec priesthood being the authority which administers in spiritual things, and by which the gospel is preached, it follows that when it is extant among men, the gospel also should be committed; and that Melchisedec having held this priesthood would lead to the belief that the gospel was preached in his day, long before the time of the apostles." Just so, my friend. There is nothing more true. "What! faith in God, in Jesus Christ and the gospel

system away back in those olden times!" Certainly, why not? Paul says, "The gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." (Rom. i. 16.) It is the means of salvation. "And hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." (2 Tim. i. 10.) This is the only means by which the condition of eternal life may be obtained; no other is known; and since men were saved in the time of Adam, Enoch, Noah, and Abraham, it follows that they must have been in possession of a knowledge of the gospel and obeyed it.

Reader, what induced you to obey the gospel? Was it not because you were persuaded that it was a duty, and that you could not be saved without? If *you* cannot be saved without obeying the gospel, how could Enoch, Abraham, Melchisedec, Moses, etc.? God is not partial nor a respecter of persons. Upon what principle of justice and impartiality could he save the ancients without obeying the gospel, and condemn you for not obeying it? You answer, "A man is responsible for what he knows," and *assume* that they did not know of the gospel, and therefore could not obey it; which is to say that they entered heaven on the plea of ignorance, — climbed up some other way. Jesus says, "He that climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber." Ignorance will never point the way to heaven as a means of rescue for sinners, else Christ would never have commanded his ministry, "Go teach all nations." "He that heareth you heareth me." (Luke x. 16.) "And whosoever will not receive you, when ye go out of that city, shake off the

very dust from your feet for a testimony against them." (Luke ix. 5.) The gospel is the road to heaven. He that hears and obeys it has the promise of heaven; but he that obeys it not has not the promise of a celestial glory.

The gospel requires, first, a belief in God and in Jesus Christ. Paul says:—

"To us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him." — 1 Cor. viii. 6.

Jesus said, "Ye believe in God, believe also in me." (John xiv. 1.) These are the objects of faith, confidence, and worship in a gospel sense. Secondly, a compliance with the commandments given is required. "He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me," said Jesus. (John xiv. 21.) "Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them." (Matt. vii. 24.) Yes, it is written, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." (Mark xvi. 16.) Faith is a first requirement. "Without faith it is impossible to please God." (Heb. xi. 6.) Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, had this testimony that he pleased God. (Heb. xi. 5.) He must have had faith or he could not have *pleased* him. He also walked with God three hundred years, and was not, for God took him (Gen. v. 22, 23, 24), gave him eternal life, which is given through the gospel. It is written, "This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent." (John xvii. 3.) Enoch repented, ceased from sin, and

"walked with God." All have sinned. The preacher said, "For there is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not." (Ec. vii. 20.) (See 1 John i. 8; 1 Kings viii. 46.)

Enoch was baptized, for Jesus said, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (John iii. 5.) Again: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Enoch was taken to heaven—saved; hence he must have been baptized.

He was also endowed with the Holy Spirit and prophesied, hence it is not unreasonable that he should have obeyed the ordinance of the laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost. (See Acts viii. 17; Jude.)

He believed also in the second coming of the Saviour, the resurrection from the dead, and eternal judgment:

"And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him."—Jude 14, 15.

Here it is shown in consecutive order that the ancients believed in the gospel in its fulness, as set forth by Jesus and the apostles, — in the doctrines of faith, repentance, baptism, the laying on of hands, the resurrection of the dead, and eternal judgment, including the personal coming of the Saviour to judge the world. (Heb. vi. 1, 2.) Noah "walked with God" (Gen. vi. 9), was a "preacher of righteousness." (2 Peter ii. 5.) Paul says the "righteousness of God"

is revealed in the gospel. (Rom. i. 17.) Hence Noah must have embraced and preached the gospel system, by which he condemned the world before the flood, "wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water." (1 Peter iii. 20.) "By faith Noah, . . . moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house; by the which he . . . became *heir* of the righteousness which is by faith." (Heb. xi. 7.)

Further, Paul says: "The Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham." (Gal. iii. 8.) The gospel must have been on the earth at that time, and some one authorized, by the conferring of the priesthood, to preach it. For it is written:—

"How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach, except they be sent?"—Rom. x. 14, 15.

Abraham heard, believed, and obeyed; and became the "heir of the world" by the righteousness which is by faith. (Rom. iv.; James ii. 20-24.) That "God would justify the heathen through faith," is equal to the saying of Peter at the household of Cornelius, "In every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." (Acts x. 35.) That is, none were to be excluded. Peter had been taught, under the law, that the heathen had no place in the bond of salvation; but when the gospel was recommitted, he was informed that it was for all nations. "In every nation he that feareth God, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." The law was to the Jewish

nation; the gospel to all nations, both before and after the law. The gospel was taught to Abraham, and he, being converted from the idolatry of his fathers, became identified with "the priest of the most high God"—Melchisedec (Gen. xiv. 18; Gal. iii. 6; James ii. 23; Rom. iv. 3-9); in other words, with the people of the Lord. The priesthood and the gospel were extant at the same time.

Again Paul says:—

"For unto us was the gospel preached, as well as unto them [the Israelites in the wilderness]: but the word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it."—Heb. iv. 2.

There was a church established in the wilderness. Moses was in that church. "This is he, that was in the *church* in the wilderness with the angel which spake to him in the mount Sina." (Acts vii. 38.) They believed in Christ. It is written, Moses esteemed "the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt." (Heb. xi. 26.) The Israelites were also baptized.

"And [they] were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; and did all eat the same spiritual meat; and did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ."—1 Cor. x. 2-4.

This accounts for the conferring of the priesthood in the time of Moses. For both the Melchisedec and Aaronic priesthoods were conferred upon the ministry in the camp of Israel. It is written, "Moses and Aaron among his priests." (Ps. xcix. 6.) It is also written



concerning Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, that they were Levites and had been selected for the service of the tabernacle and to administer to the congregation. (Num. xvi. ; also iii. 41, and viii. 14 ; Deut. x. 8.)

In Num. xvi. 10 Moses is made to say : —

“ And he hath brought thee near to him, and all thy brethren the sons of Levi with thee : and seek ye the priesthood also ? ” (Or, “ seek ye the high priesthood also ? ” — *Inspired Translation.*)

This latter rendering is evidently the true sense. For Korah, Dathan, and Abiram were already separated to the service of the tabernacle and held the lesser or Aaronic priesthood, but they aspired to still higher honors. They were jealous of the high honor conferred upon Moses, and sought to turn away the congregation from him. Said they to Moses and Aaron : —

“ Ye take too much upon you, seeing all the congregation are holy ; . . . wherefore then lift ye up yourselves above the congregation of the Lord ? ” — Num. xvi. 3.

How could Moses be esteemed as above or over them unless he held a higher priesthood and office than they ? Moses would not permit Aaron to be included with him. Said he, “ And what is Aaron, that ye murmur against him ? ” (Num. xvi. 11.) This is equivalent to saying that Aaron did not hold the same priesthood that Moses did, but an inferior one. He held the highest office in the priesthood to which Korah and Dathan belonged, however ; hence they sought a place in the “ high priesthood.” Moses held the higher priesthood, or that of Melchisedec, for he was a priest and officiated at the

altar. He, moreover, consecrated Aaron to the highest office in the Aaronic priesthood, and yet he was superior to Aaron and presided over him. This could not have been had he held the same priesthood in kind.

Again, Moses says : —

“ The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken.” — Deut. xviii. 15.

This prophecy refers to Christ. The phrase “ like unto me ” shows that they held a like priesthood, authority, and office, and were both law-givers. Jesus was a high priest after the order of Melchisedec. Moses to have been “ like unto ” him must have held the same priesthood. It was this honor to which Korah and Dathan aspired, — the highest authority and the highest seat.\*

Thus it has been shown : (1.) That previous to the advent of the Saviour, two priesthoods had been committed, viz., the Melchisedec and the Aaronic; that the gospel was administered by the authority of the Melchisedec priesthood, and the law by that of Aaron; that the priesthood was conferred in the days of Adam, and was held by Enoch, Noah, Abraham, and Moses; and that the Aaronic priesthood continued with the Jews from the time of Moses until the coming of Christ. It is claimed at least that the line was an unbroken one.

(2.) That when Abraham was blessed of Melchisedec, Abraham was a priest and accustomed to administer at the altar. This he could not have done acceptably had he not held the priesthood. Melchise-

dec having held the authority to bless Abraham shows him to have been the greater of the two, and proves the existence of two classes of priests extant at that time. Paul says, "Without all contradiction the less is blessed of the better" (greater). (Heb. vii. 7.) In the same chapter he affirms that the authority held by Melchisedec is without beginning of days or end of life.

(3.) That God is unchangeable and his law immutable; that he committed these two priesthoods in ancient times for the purpose of authorizing men to administer his government on the earth; and it is but legitimate to conclude that his law could not be legally administered without them; and as we look to this same unchangeable God, by obeying his unchangeable laws, to obtain *life*, it is plain that these priesthoods should exist among men in this day, that religious observances may be with authority and acceptable. As it is written in the Epistle of James, chapter one and seventeenth verse: "Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning."

## CHAPTER III.

POSITIONS IN THE PRIESTHOOD CANNOT BE ASSUMED WITH IMPUNITY.—THE MELCHISEDEC AND THE AARONIC PRIESTHOODS WERE CONFERRED UPON THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

MEN in no age that we read of could assume the positions in the priesthood with impunity. They were powers with which God would honor whomsoever he pleased, and blessings followed upon the head of the obedient and called. Anathemas and chastisements overtook the haughty assumer. Hence the proud and ambitious Saul lost his kingdom, and persistent Uzziah was smitten with leprosy for arrogating the powers of the sacred offices of the priesthood. (1 Sam. xiii. 9 ; 2 Chron. xxvi. 18.)

Paul says :—

“No man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron. So also Christ glorified not himself to be made a high priest ; but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, to day have I begotten thee.” — Heb. v. 4, 5.

He uses this language in vindication of the right that the Saviour had to officiate in the priesthood, proving thereby that he was not an *usurper* of authority, — did not glorify himself to be made a high priest by *assuming* the right, — but that he had received it by divine appointment.

“As he saith also in another place, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec.” — Heb. v. 6.

This language was used by Paul in order to put to silence those who were disposed to question the divine call and appointment of the Saviour to the priesthood. His letter was addressed to the Hebrews, who were skilled in the Jewish law and acknowledged that a divine call was a prerequisite to the occupancy of the priest's office. Hence it is affirmed in the tenth verse, that he (Christ) was "*called* of God a high priest after the order of Melchisedec."

From the evidences cited it will scarcely be questioned that the Melchisedec and Aaronic priesthoods, one or both, were recognized authorities by which the people of God rendered an acceptable service during the times of the patriarchs, the law, and the prophets, although at times known by other appellations.

So we come now to inquire whether either or both of these priesthoods were introduced into the Christian dispensation.

Christ, who was the founder of the Christian system, held the Melchisedec priesthood. He was also the chief Apostle and High Priest therein. This is put beyond all question. Hence it is direct proof that the Melchisedec priesthood is a necessary authority in preaching and administering the gospel system; for Christ did not administer the "rites and ceremonies" of the law, but came "preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God." (Mark i. 14.) If he could have preached the gospel acceptably without the priesthood, why was it conferred upon him? Why impose upon him an unnecessary thing? If Christ could not preach and

administer the gospel except by the authority of the Melchisedec priesthood, can others? If so, who are they, and how did they find it out? "To the law and to the testimony: and if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."

John the Baptist held the Aaronic priesthood. In proof of this I cite that he was in direct line of that priesthood, his father being a priest and his mother of the daughters of Aaron. (Luke i. 15.) He was a Nazarite from his birth (Luke i. 15), and was doubtless consecrated to the priesthood as he was to the service of the Lord, being a "Nazarite."

Back at Sinai, God said: —

"Now, therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people; for all the earth is mine:

"And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests." — Ex. xix. 5, 6.

Whether the Israelites ever attained to a realization of the full meaning of this promise or not, it is, nevertheless, a fact that their institution was invested with an authority and priesthood that even kings could not intrude themselves or disregard with impunity. After Moses, the Aaronic priesthood was the authority and strength of the whole Jewish ecclesiasticism or kingdom.

The high priest standing by the "ark of the covenant," with the "urim and thummim" before him, was the eyes and ears and mouth of the famed theocracy.

The priests were the educators of the people. "They [the priests] shall teach Jacob thy judgments, and

Israel thy law." (Deut. xxxiii. 10.) Upon these (the priesthood and the law) the kingdom of Israel was built. (Ex. xix. 5, 6; Deut. xxxiii. 1-11 inclusive.) God recognized the line in which the priesthood was to be transmitted in sending his angel to good old Zacharias, "while he executed the priest's office before God in the order of his course," as seen in the following:—

"There was in the days of Herod, the king of Judea, a certain priest named Zacharias, of the course of Abia: and his wife was of the daughters of Aaron, and her name was Elisabeth.

"And they were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless.

"And they had no child, because that Elisabeth was barren: and they both were now well stricken in years.

"And it came to pass, that, while he executed the priest's office before God in the order of his course,

"According to the *custom* of the *priest's office*, his lot was to burn incense when he went into the temple of the Lord.

"And the whole multitude of the people were praying without at the time of incense.

"And there appeared unto him an angel of the Lord standing on the right side of the altar of incense.

"And when Zacharias saw him, he was troubled, and fear fell upon him.

"But the angel said unto him, Fear not, Zacharias: for thy prayer is heard; and thy wife Elisabeth shall bear thee a son, and thou shalt call his name John.

"And thou shalt have joy and gladness; and many shall rejoice at his birth.

"For he shall be great in the sight of the Lord, and shall drink neither wine nor strong drink; and he shall be filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb.

"And many of the children of Israel shall he turn to the Lord their God.

"And he shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias." — Luke i. 5-17.

This priest Zacharias walked "in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless," a true representative of his honored tribe, a faithful priest of the kingdom of Israel. It was announced that his son, yet unborn, should be the "prophet of the highest," to "go before him [the Lord] in the spirit and power of Elias."

Elias was invested with the priesthood, — was an Aaronic priest. John the Baptist to come in his "spirit" and "power" would need to come bearing the same priesthood and inspired with the same spirit. Hence when he cried, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," and the people gathered unto him, he baptized them by the authority of the inherited priesthood which had been conferred upon him, and at the specific call and direction of the Almighty to go and baptize. (John i. 6, 33.)

By the authority of this priesthood Jesus was baptized, together with the multitudes that came to John's baptism. The Jews would have had no regard for John's preaching and baptism had they not believed him to have been an accredited representative of their priesthood. His authority was questioned by none. In the persons of Jesus and John, therefore, there were represented upon the shores of Jordan, at the "beginning of the gospel," the Melchisedec and the Aaronic priesthoods, by which the gospel was preached and administered.

Further: Isaiah says that while the "old wastes" are being "builded," and the "former desolations repaired," the "ministers of our God" are to be named the "priests of the Lord." (Isa. lxi. 6.)



This is predicted to take place in the Christian dispensation, during the time of God's "preparation." At that time, among the ministers of the Lord, there are to be "priests." If they be Melchisedec priests, then we have further proof that high priests of that order belong to the Christian institution. If Aaronic priests are intended, then the Levitical priesthood belongs with the Christian system, the very thing affirmed by us. In either case, this is proof that the priesthood and priests belong to the Christian institution.

A divine call was an essential qualification to the occupying of the office of the priesthood in olden times. During the long period that elapsed from Abel to John the Baptist, there is no rule or ecclesiastical precedent permitting self-constituted ministers; but every case of usurpation cited met with reprimand and positive rejection. Is it reasonable to conclude, therefore, that God would deviate from his usual course of four thousand years' standing, in recommitting the gospel in the Saviour's time? Would it not be most unreasonable to believe that he would not act like himself, follow in "the old paths," appoint whom he would?

Jesus and John *claimed divine appointment and authority* for their missions. Jesus said, "I come not to do my own will, but the will of him that sent me." "The Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak." (John xii. 49.) Said John: —

"He that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and

remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost." — John i. 33.

"There was a man sent from God, whose name was John." — John i. 6.

The first ministers who preached the gospel at the opening of the Christian dispensation, then, did not assume the authority to act; but like their predecessors, Melchisedec, Abraham, Moses, etc., they were *sent*. Jesus was "called of God a high priest after the order of Melchisedec." (Heb. v. 10.) This is irrefutable proof that the priesthood was in the church which was established by the Saviour.

If it be held that Jesus was made a high priest in order that he might offer the last sacrifice, of which all others had been the type, I answer that this could have been done by the authority of "the priest's office" in the Levitical priesthood, which was then extant; and there were priests of that order, the descendants of Aaron, who officiated regularly at the altar.

High priests after the order of Melchisedec have a right to administer in and confer all lower orders of priesthood. This is shown in the circumstance of Moses, who was a priest of the Melchisedec order and accustomed to officiate at the altar, conferring the "priest's office" upon Aaron. (Num. xvi.; Ex. xl.) It would appear, then, that higher authorities officiating in lower offices, do so by the exercise of the authority belonging to the office in which they are acting, the less being included in the greater.

When Jesus began to form a ministry, he followed the ancient precedent; called persons to offices in the

priesthood, and set them apart to their several duties. So we read : —

“And it came to pass in those days, that he went out into a mountain to pray, and continued all night in prayer to God. And when it was day, he called unto him his disciples: and of them he chose twelve, whom also he named apostles.” — Luke vi. 12, 13.

Again : —

“He ordained twelve . . . that he might send them forth to preach.” — Mark iii. 14.

They were chosen, named, and ordained apostles. Why ordain them? Why not send them without an ordination? Ordination is the conferring of authority upon an individual that he may properly perform the duties upon which he is sent. Could the apostles have accomplished the errand upon which they were sent, or even have been sent, without an *ordination*? If so, why ordain them? Why go through a useless and dead form? To argue that the apostles could have been sent as competent ministers without an ordination, is to charge Jesus with performing a work of no validity, a sham. None knew better than he what was necessary. What was the authority to which the twelve disciples were chosen and ordained? The Aaronic priesthood? No. Paul said : —

“If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, (for under it the people received the law,) what further need was there that another priest should rise after the order of Melchisedec, and not be called after the order of Aaron?” — Heb. vii. 11.

The apostles were sent to preach the “perfect law of

liberty," — "the gospel," — which secured eternal life to the believers. Jesus ordained them. He was a high priest after the order of Melchisedec, as has been shown, and it is logical to conclude that he ordained the twelve apostles to offices in that priesthood which he held, as they were to preach and administer the same gospel. There is no such office in the Aaronic priesthood as that of an apostle; but there is in that of the Melchisedec priesthood. Paul says, "Inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify mine office." (Rom. xi. 13.) Jesus was an "Apostle and High Priest." (Heb. iii. 1.)

"I admit," says the objector, "that Jesus held the Melchisedec priesthood, which was necessary to his ministry, but I do not believe that the apostles held it." Query: What was that authority, then, which was conferred upon the apostles when Jesus ordained them? If they could preach the gospel, heal the sick, administer the Spirit, cast out devils, etc., without the priesthood, why could not Jesus? He was their chief in point of office and character. Was the priesthood of any benefit to him? If not, why was it conferred on him? Evidently it was the authority by which he ministered and established his church. The apostles were his authorized agents in preaching the gospel and building it up. They too, then, must have held a like authority.

Jesus said, "As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them." (John xvii. 18.) His Father sent him into the world holding the Melchisedec priesthood. The apostles, to be sent like him, must have received a like authority or priesthood.

Again, it is written : —

“The Lord appointed other seventy also, and sent two and two before his face.” — Luke x. 1.

Luke is the only writer who mentions the sending of the seventy ; and he does not say that they were ordained to positions in the priesthood, but there is every reason to believe that they were ordained, and that, too, to the Melchisedec order ; for there was no such office as that of seventy in the Levitical priesthood. Then, again, the seventy possessed about as much power and right as did the apostles. They went forth two and two and preached the gospel, healed the sick, cast out devils, and were given authority over all the power of the enemy. (Luke x. 1–19.)

The Saviour gave them their authority. As neither he nor the apostles could engage in the ministry until they were placed in positions in the priesthood, the sensible conclusion is that none others could. So the seventy were ordained also.

To put the question beyond all controversy that the Christian ministry was authorized by being placed in positions in the priesthood, we have but to refer to the language of Peter, as follows : —

“Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ.” — 1 Peter ii. 5.

Here are *lively stones*, a *spiritual house*, a HOLY PRIESTHOOD to *offer up spiritual sacrifices*. Peter is a false witness, or the priesthood was given to the Christian ministry. It would be folly to talk of a priesthood where there was none ; and where there was a priest-

hood there was a priest's office and a priest. When Jesus was appointed chief apostle and high priest in the Melchisedec priesthood, he had attained the highest position that was ever conferred upon God's ministry. Hence the term "royal priesthood," or kingly authority. So we read : —

"And Melchizedek king of Salem brought forth bread and wine: and he was the priest of the most high God. And he blessed him, and said, Blessed be Abram of the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth." — Gen. xiv. 18, 19.

Dr. William Smith, in his smaller Dictionary of the Bible, page 337, says : —

"There is something surprising and mysterious in the first appearance of Melchisedec and the subsequent reference to him. Bearing a title which Jews in after ages would recognize as designating their own sovereign, bearing gifts which recall to Christians the Lord's supper, this Canaanite crosses for a moment the path of Abram, and is unhesitatingly recognized as a person of higher spiritual rank than the friend of God."

Jesus Christ is the royal son of David. The angel said to Mary : —

"The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." — Luke i. 32, 33.

"When the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." — Matt. xix. 28. (See Matt. xx. 21; Luke xxii. 28, 29, 30.)

Again, speaking of the saints : —

"And hast made us unto our God kings and priests; and we shall reign on the earth." — Rev. v. 10. (See Rev. i. 6; xx. 6; xxii. 5.)

How could saints or others be constituted "kings

and priests" where there was no priesthood or royal authority? Moses was "king in Jeshurun, when the heads of the people and the tribes of Israel were gathered together." (Deut. xxxiii. 5.) Moses in official standing was properly a type of Christ.

The prophets, also, have foretold that the priesthood would be on the earth during the great preparatory work of preaching the gospel and the building up of the church just preceding the coming of the Saviour, or end of the world.

Joel says: —

"Let the priests, the ministers of the Lord, weep between the porch and the altar, and let them say, Spare thy people. . . . I will send you corn, and wine, and oil, and ye shall be satisfied therewith: and I will no more make you a reproach among the heathen." — Joel ii. 17, 19.

"And I will also take of them for priests and for Levites, saith the Lord." — Isa. lxvi. 21.

"But ye shall be named the Priests of the Lord: men shall call you the Ministers of our God." — Isa. lxi. 6.

These texts have reference to the time when God shall redeem the land of Israel, and bring back the captivity of his people, when an abundance of wine, corn, and oil shall be given, and the Israelitish name be no more defamed among the heathen. At that time there are to be priests, the "ministers of God"; and if priests, then priesthood and a priest's office. This is yet in the future. Nothing strange, then, that it is written there was conferred upon Phineas and his posterity "the covenant of an everlasting priesthood." (Num. xxv. 13.)

Thus holy men of God have predicted, "as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," that the priesthood would be extant in the Christian dispensation, and of course men duly appointed to fill the several offices therein, of which three distinctions have been shown, viz., that of the chief apostle and high priest, those of the twelve apostles and the seventy.

As confirmatory evidence upon this question, I cite the testimony of the Fathers, some of whom were contemporary with the apostles.

Clement, who was a companion of Paul, and whose name is said to be in the "book of life" (Phil. iv. 3), wrote to the church at Corinth as follows:—

"It will behoove us [Christians], looking into the depth of divine knowledge, to do all things in order, whatsoever our Lord has commanded us to do. He has ordained by his supreme will and authority, both where and by what persons they [the sacred services] are to be performed. For the CHIEF PRIEST has his proper office, and the PRIESTS their proper place is appointed, and the layman is confined to that which is commanded to laymen."

"St. Clement of Rome, and St. Jerome (whom especially I cite because appealed to by our opponents), *both concur* in speaking of the order of the Christian ministry under the very terms of high priests, priests, and Levites, which obtained under the Mosaic dispensation."—The Hon. and Rev. A. P. PERCIVILLE, B. C. S., Chaplain in ordinary to the Queen, in his "Apology for Apostolic Succession." Also "Christian Antiquities," by Bingham, Vol. I., page 11.

"What Aaron and his sons were among the Jews, the bishop and his presbyters were among the Christians."—ST. JEROME.

"St. Jerome, who will be allowed to speak the sense, . . . says that both in the Old and New Testaments the high priests are one order, the priests another, and the Levites another."—BINGHAM, page 50.



Of the "chief priests" he says : —

"It was no human invention, but an original settlement of the apostles themselves, which they made by divine appointment." — BINGHAM, page 54.

Again : —

"Now this is most expressly said by Theodoret, that he [Ignatius] received the gift of the *high priesthood* from the hand of the great Peter." — Page 60. Also Vol. I., p. 16.

Here it is stated that not only was the Melchisedec priesthood conferred on the Christian ministry, but the Aaronic or Levitical priesthood also; that the high priest under the law was at the head of the latter, and the bishop occupied its chief office under the Christian order. They were frequently called by the title which obtained under the law, "the very terms of *high priests, priests, and Levites.*"

Says Dr. Smith, Bible Dictionary, page 1646 : —

"In the mean time the old name had acquired a new signification. The early writers of the Christian Church applied to the latter hierarchy and gave to the bishops and presbyters the title of priests that had belonged to the sons of Aaron; while the deacons are habitually spoken of as Levites."

(Page 29)

## CHAPTER IV.

THE CHANGE OF THE LEVITICAL PRIESTHOOD FROM DUTIES UNDER THE LAW TO SERVICES IN THE GOSPEL SYSTEM. — IT IS INFERIOR TO THE MELCHISEDEC PRIESTHOOD. — THE OFFICES IN THE PRIESTHOOD ARE PERPETUAL, THE OCCUPANTS TRANSITORY. — THEY WERE FILLED BY DIVINE APPOINTMENT IN THE CHRISTIAN DISPENSATION. — PROVISION IN THE PRIESTHOOD FOR APOSTLES, SEVENTIES, HIGH PRIESTS, PROPHETS, ELDERS, BISHOPS, PRIESTS, TEACHERS, AND DEACONS. — THE NEW TESTAMENT THE STANDARD OR TEST BY WHICH ALL RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS SHOULD BE TRIED, AND THOSE FOUND NOT TO BE IN HARMONY WITH THIS PATTERN SHOULD BE REJECTED.

THE Apostle Paul informs us that the Melchisedec priesthood is "unchangeable." From this it is implied that there is one susceptible of change in some sense; and as we read of but two, this one must be the Aaronic priesthood. The change could not consist in a transition from one to the other; for this would indicate a change in both. Neither would it do to say that the change consisted in the abrogation of one and the creation of the other at will. That would simply be one superseding the other without any necessary change.

Some have speculated that Paul meant to convey by this statement that the Aaronic priesthood ceased by limitation — was abrogated — and the Melchisedec took its place. Still others, that it was changed from

duties under the law to those under the gospel. But neither of these positions is the correct one, although it is granted that the Aaronic priesthood was transferred or changed from duties under the law to services in the Christian church.

Paul was reasoning with those holding Jewish ideas, former adherents of the Jewish law, who were not willing to accept fully the idea that the gospel was to supplant or take the place of their long-cherished system of worship which was administered by the Levitical priesthood; hence he quoted from David to show that another order of priests was to arise, who would hold a different priesthood from that held by Aaron, and from this he argues the necessity for the giving of another law. For why give another priesthood to administer the existing law, as there were priests then who were discharging that duty? He says: —

“It is yet far more evident: for that after the similitude of Melchisedec there ariseth another priest, who is made, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life.” — Heb. vii. 15, 16.

It was easier for Paul to prove the arising of a Melchisedec priest than the giving of a new law, and he makes this the basis of his argument and goes on to show, and logically too, the necessity for the giving of another law. Hence, with his profound reasoning, he could force the objector to accept a belief in the establishment of a new law other than that given by Moses, either at that or some future time.

While this is true and the Melchisedec is shown to be the “unchangeable” priesthood, it is implied by the

statement that the Aaronic priesthood is in some sense changeable. This change, it is easy and reasonable to conclude, consists in its being adaptable and transferable from one service to another. Hence it was brought over or transferred from the peculiar service and demands under the law of Moses, to take its place in the administration of certain ordinances and minor duties to be observed in the system of worship and church government established by Christ.

But as this is strongly controverted by our opponents, for their benefit the discussion of the question is here extended.

As has been proved, John the Baptist being in the line of the Levitical priesthood, he represented in person that authority, or the Jewish Levitical kingdom proper, as the forerunner, preparing the way. For by inheritance the Aaronic priesthood was invested in him of right, as that of Melchisedec was in Christ.

A new era had dawned. A new order of things was to be established. The old covenant was to be displaced by the new. For three years John and Jesus and the apostles were preparing the people for this transition or change. The "beginning of the gospel" sounded the alarm in the words, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." The time had come for "blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross" (Col. ii. 14), and erecting instead thereof "a spiritual house [or kingdom], a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ."

The Jews were rebellious. Their ears were closed, and they refused to hear the "voice of the good Shepherd."

"Therefore say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." — Matt. xxi. 43.

A new nation was to be born; a new kingdom set up. All the authority and excellences attaching to the old Levitical "kingdom of priests" were to be transferred to the new kingdom. Divested of its power and life, the old ceased from necessity. The new had its inception in the baptism of John. Here is where the Aaronic priesthood began to be changed from services under the old covenant to the administration of services under the new. The old was to be "abolished." In the new kingdom or church were blended again, as in the times of Moses, Abraham, and Melchisedec, the Melchisedec and Aaronic priesthoods, in the persons of Jesus and the "Elias," or John the Baptist. A new institution, a new service, and a new covenant were introduced. "He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second." (Heb. x. 9.)

Wherefore it is written : —

"This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them." — Heb. x. 16. (See Jer. xxxi. 31-34.)

So Paul wrote : "For if that which is done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious." (2 Cor. iii. 11.)

Again : "Hath made us able ministers of the new testament." (Verse 6.)

This new covenant was to be as enduring as that of day and night. "Priests" and "Levites" were to be the "ministers" of God under it; and "David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel." (Jer. xxxiii. 17.)

This was predicted as the order of things to obtain under the Christian system, "priests" and "Levites" were to form a part of the spiritual building. Christ, who is both King and Priest, is heir of the world. While he reigns upon the throne of his father David, his saints will reign as "kings and priests" with him. (Rev. i. 6.) Even in the millennium "they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years." (Rev. xx. 6.)

Further : —

"And when he was demanded of the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God should come, he answered them and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: neither shall they say, Lo here! or, lo there! for, behold, the kingdom of God is within you"; or as it reads in the margin, "among you." — Luke xvii. 20, 21.

Paul wrote: "The kingdom of God is not in word, but in power." (1 Cor. iv. 20.)

The gross minds of the Pharisees could not perceive anything but a showy political kingdom. They were looking for one of that character, and of great strength just suited to their vanity.

But Jesus disabused their minds regarding it, by declaring: "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: . . . behold, the kingdom of God is within [among] you." It was to be in "power," not in a

political sense, but in a spiritual and authoritative sense.

It had been with Israel, in part, from the ratification of the covenant and the setting up of the Levitical service under Moses, until the "Elias," who, as an ambassador from God, clothed with the authority of the Aaronic priesthood, became a legal representative of the ecclesiastical power or kingdom of the Jews, their order and polity, the grandest representative of that authority of his time.

But the Jewish priests would not receive his message ; yet the priesthood or power which he represented permeated the whole order of their worship, at least at the beginning, without which it had not been, and could not be.

The Melchisedec priesthood was represented in the person of Christ. Both Jesus and John were debtors to the law. "One jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled." (Matt. v. 18.) In God's economy, the Jews as a nation were first favored. It was their right and privilege to hold on to and possess all the authority and power of an inherited priesthood, with the further privilege, as the full time had come, of receiving the Melchisedec priesthood, also, in the personage of Jesus Christ, with all the blessings that it might bring to them as a people by the setting up of the kingdom of God. But they put the chief High Priest from them. He came unto his own, but his own received him not. They said, "His blood be on us, and on our children."

Jesus declared, because they rejected his message,

"Behold, your house is left unto you desolate." (Matt. xxiii. 38.) Their cup of iniquity was full.

Jesus, with his disciples, standing in the midst of the Jews, represented the Melchisedec and the Aaronic priesthods, upon one or the other of which, or both, rested both the Jewish and Christian institutions, the old and new covenants, now tendered solely to the descendants of Abraham, if they would but receive it. But they rejected the offer and their King, and Jesus announced, "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof."

Paul said, "Seeing ye judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles." The priesthood was transferred. The Jewish house went down; and the kingdom of God was given to the Gentiles. Israel "stumbled at that stumbling stone."

Says Dr. Smith on this point:—

"From the illustrations adopted by St. Paul in his epistles, we have additional light thrown upon the condition of the church. Thus (Rom. xi. 17) the Christian church is described as being a branch grafted on the already existing olive-tree, showing that it was no new creation, but a development of that spiritual life which has flourished in the patriarchal and the Jewish church." — *Bible Dictionary*, Vol. I., page 454.

Belonging to these two divisions of power in the Christian system there were the superior and inferior grades of office, ranging all the way from those of the highest spiritual functions to those that but "served tables." Paul asks, "Are all apostles? are all prophets? are all teachers?" (1 Cor. xii. 29.) Of course



not. "The twelve called the multitude of the disciples unto them, and said, It is not reason that we should leave the word of God, and serve tables." (Acts vi. 2.) This is to say, that while the apostles might serve tables, it was not "reason" that they should, when they had higher and more responsible duties to do, which others could not do. So the apostles said: —

"Look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business." — Acts vi. 3.

When they were selected they were "set before the apostles: and when they had prayed, they laid their hands on them." (Verse 6.) The laying on of hands was to confer authority upon these persons, by which they were enabled to act. If it had been the Melchisedec priesthood that was conferred, their duties would have been very similar to that of the apostles, viz., to preach "the word of God." But it was to administer a daily routine, a temporal service, just that kind of service that was administered by the Aaronic priesthood under the law. For the "first covenant had" ordinances, "a tabernacle," "wherein was the candlestick, and the table, and the shewbread." "When these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the first tabernacle, . . . in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, . . . which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances." (Heb. ix. 1, 2, 6, 9, 10.)

This service was administered by the Aaronic priesthood. It was a daily round. This authority could

administer a similar service under the gospel plan — “serve tables.”

The service of the “worldly sanctuary,” which “was a figure” of the true (Heb. ix. 9), was committed unto Aaron and his sons. Between this authority and that held by Moses there was a marked distinction of power and privilege and glory, that of Moses excelling. So we read that —

“Miriam and Aaron spake against Moses,” and said, “Hath the Lord indeed spoken only by Moses? hath he not spoken also by us? And the Lord heard it.”—Num. xii. 1, 2. “And he said, Hear now my words: If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make myself known unto him in a vision, and will speak unto him in a dream. My servant Moses is not so, who is faithful in all mine house. With him will I speak mouth to mouth, even apparently, and not in dark speeches; and the similitude of the Lord shall he behold.”—Num. xii. 6, 7, 8.

After Moses had set Aaron apart to the chief seat in “the priest’s office,” or Levitical priesthood, to administer in “the worldly sanctuary,” the higher authority, that which chiefly administers in spiritual things, by which men are brought nigh unto, and in communion with God, remained with Moses.

Hence we read: —

“Gather unto me seventy men of the elders of Israel, whom thou knowest to be the elders of the people, and officers over them; and bring them unto the tabernacle of the congregation, that they may stand there with thee.

“And I will come down and talk with thee there: and I will take of the spirit which is upon thee, and will put it upon them; and they shall bear the burden of the people with thee.”

“And the Lord came down in a cloud, and spake unto him, and took of the spirit that was upon him, and gave it unto the

seventy elders: and it came to pass, that, when the spirit rested upon them, they prophesied, and did not cease." — Num. xi. 16, 17, 25.

Thus it is shown that Moses and the seventy elders were associated together in the government of the church in the wilderness, in an authority higher and separate from that which was conferred upon Aaron and his sons.

Assuming, as has been proved, that Moses held the Melchisedec priesthood and the "seventy elders" to have been directly associated with him, connects the office of elder with the Melchisedec authority. This was the ruling authority. The priesthood of Aaron was inferior to it in power and importance. Indeed the lesser priesthood it would seem was but an "appendage" to the greater one. It was to bear a necessary part, however, in the established services.

In view of these facts, there is nothing surprising in the following statement of Moses regarding Aaron, on an occasion when a test of authority was to be made: "And what is Aaron, that ye murmur against him?" He was of inferior rank. Well might Moses also speak of the great prophet of the future: —

"The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, *like unto me.*"

Hence in the establishing of the "spiritual house," to offer up "spiritual sacrifices" under the new covenant, by which men were permitted to

"come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the firstborn

which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant " (Heb. xii. 22, 23 24),

it was necessary that it be endowed with all the authority and power belonging to God's order of government in former ages. So that it is written of the Master of this house, the chief Architect of this building, "Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec," holding the "royal priesthood," like unto Melchisedec and Moses, by which the saints are made "kings and priests."

The Melchisedec and Aaronic priesthoods constituted the authority under the new covenant as well as under the old, in the time of Moses, and their duties are separate and distinct, each having its proper service. Hence the apostles left the "serving of tables" and attended to preaching "the word of God." Paul says, "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel" (1 Cor. i. 17), showing that others might and did do that work.

That the Aaronic priesthood was conferred upon the Christian ministry, as well as that of the Melchisedec, may further be shown from the distinction of authority and office held by them, and the testimony of the prophets and early Fathers, already cited.

Philip could preach the gospel and baptize persons, but he could not or did not lay on hands for the obtaining of the Holy Ghost. He baptized a large number at Samaria; but Peter and John laid hands on them for the receiving of the Holy Ghost. (Acts viii. 14, 15, 16.) Peter, John, and Ananias could lay on hands,

but it seems Philip could not. (Acts ix. 12, 17.) This indicates a distinction of authority in the church, and that among the ministry. Elders could lay on hands (James v. 14) ; hence Philip must have held an inferior office to this ; and as it has been shown that the office of elder was intimately connected with the Melchisedec priesthood, or belonged to it, in the time of Moses, —and so far as any evidence appears, is the inferior office in that priesthood, —it follows that Philip belonged to the Aaronic priesthood. The elders governed with Moses in the wilderness, so under the gospel, Paul says to the elders at Ephesus : —

“Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God.” — Acts xx. 28.

They governed and could lay on hands ; Philip could preach and baptize. This was true of John the Baptist. He could preach and baptize, and point to the “Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world.” But there is no instance given that he laid on hands for the reception of the Spirit. There is a striking similarity between the administrations of Philip and John the Baptist ; sufficient, indeed, to incline one to the belief that they held the same priesthood in kind.

In view of this distinction of office found among the Christian ministry, there is nothing remarkable in the statement made by St. Jerome, that “What Aaron and his sons were among the Jews, the bishop and his presbyters were among the Christians” ; or that of Theodoret, “That he [Ignatius] received the gift of the high priesthood from the hand of the great Peter.”

Dr. Smith classes the offices of bishop and elder nearly together, as being of about equal or equivalent authority. And this is true of the office of a seventy and elder. He denies, also, that bishops anciently held that presiding authority over the ministry that is accorded to them in modern times. He says:—

“It is clear from what has been said, that episcopal functions, in the modern sense of the words, as implying a special superintendence over the ministers of the church, belonged only to the apostles and those whom they invested with their authority.” — *Bible Dictionary*, page 76.

Again:—

“With St. John’s death, the apostolic college was extinguished, and the apostolic delegates or angels [presidents of churches] were left to fill their places in the government of the church, not with the full unrestricted power of the apostles, but with an authority only to be exercised in limited districts. In the next century we find these officers bore the name of bishops, while those who in the first century were called indifferently presbyters or bishops, had now only the title of presbyters.” — *Bible Dictionary*, page 99.

This shows, as the opinion of Dr. Smith, that in the primitive church the offices of bishop and elder were not far removed from each other.

Although the offices in the priesthood of the Christian church may be in some respects indiscriminately presented, the order appears to have been about as follows: (1.) The office of “the apostle and high priest.” (2.) That of the twelve apostles. (3.) The seventy. Then followed that of high priests, bishops, elders, evangelists, pastors, teachers, deacons, etc., in their proper order. (Heb. iii. 1; Eph. iv. 11; Matt. x.;

Luke x. ; 1 Tim. iii. 2 ; Titus i. 7 ; Phil. i. 1 ; 1 Tim. iii. 1 ; Acts i. 20 ; 1 Tim. iii. 10 ; 1 Cor. xii. 28, etc., with historical citations given.) Neither is it a proper view to take that *all* the offices that were known in the church are specifically spoken of in the New Testament, for some seem to have been but incidentally mentioned ; that is, among the less important ones especially.

These offices were created, set, established by the Almighty in the priesthood, to receive occupants for the government and guidance of the churches. The several occupants took the name of the office to which they were assigned. The institution being of God, it devolved upon him to appoint whom he would to occupy them, the same as under the old government. No one had the right to arrogate to himself these functions of office. Hence it is written : —

“As God hath distributed to every man, as the Lord hath called every one, so let him walk. And so ordain I in all the churches.” — 1 Cor. vii. 17.

“Clemens Alexandrinus says that John, visiting the neighboring regions about Ephesus, ordained them bishops, and set apart such men for the clergy as were signified by the Holy Ghost.” — BINGHAM'S *Christian Antiquities*, Vol. I., page 11.

“God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers,” etc. — 1 Cor. xii. 28.

Again : —

“Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers.” — Acts xx. 28.

“No man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron.” — Heb. v. 4.

“Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them.” — Acts xiii. 2.

What a marked contrast is this with the proceedings of the nominal Christian world even of to-day, where every man sends himself, and climbs into the seat that his fancy pictures as the most honorable and lucrative, if happily by a little manipulation — wire-pulling — he may receive a sufficient number of friends to give him a majority vote for the coveted office ! Late revelation and divine appointment thereby are not believed in, — are made a mockery of. But how God can *appoint* and *not reveal* is a question for modern churchmen to solve and explain. Paul wrote : —

“He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God.” — Eph. iv. 11-13.

These officers were given to the church to administer its laws ; for its edification, upbuilding, and growth in the Lord. Hence, Paul wrote to Timothy : “Preach the word ; . . . reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine” ; to rebuke others that they might be sound in the faith ; and declared himself to be an ambassador for Christ, a preacher to the Gentiles.

These God-sent and heaven-inspired officers were the constituted authorities of the church anciently ; and if this was God’s order then, should they not be in his church now ? If not, why not ? If a part were to be taken out, what part was it, and who was to decide and take them out ?

Some one answers : “The apostles, high priests, and prophets were to be taken out.” But who said so ? If



no writer of the New Testament has said so much, who will be so presumptuous as to speak for them?

We have just as good reason to say that the elders, teachers, and deacons should be excluded from the church. But God put them in; and we say that none but God can lawfully take them out, or declare them to be no longer needed. They were placed in the church as *his constituted ministry*. To say that they have ceased is to affirm that God has no longer a recognized church or ministry; that they are not needed.

In the light of the above facts, can any organization, however proud and haughty in its claims, or large its numbers, not having these God-sent and heaven-inspired officers, be the church of Jesus Christ?

The offices of the priesthood can exist with or without an occupant. The removing of the officer does not destroy the office any more than the death of the President of the United States destroys the office which he holds. When the President dies, or is removed from office, or his term of office expires, by due process of law another may be appointed to fill the same office. The office remains although the President is dead, and to have a government proper, another must take his place. So it is in all the essential offices of the government. This is true of the kingdom of God or church of Jesus Christ. God designated men for the several offices of the priesthood. They were duly authorized to occupy them. When any one of them was removed, by death or otherwise, another was appointed to succeed him in the same office. As precedents, we refer the reader to the instance of appointing Matthias to the "bishopric"

or "office" held by Judas Iscariot. (Acts i. 16-26.) Matthias was "numbered with the eleven apostles."

Again : —

"Herod the king stretched forth his hands to vex certain of the church. And he killed James the brother of John with the sword." — Acts xii. 1, 2.

Soon after Paul was called to the apostleship.

"The Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away." — Acts xiii. 2, 3.

Inside of one year (others doubtless having been removed from office by death during the hot persecution that continued even after the killing of James) we read of "the apostles, Barnabas and Saul." (Acts xiv. 14.) Dr. Smith says : "From this time, though not of the number of the twelve, Barnabas and Paul enjoy the title and dignity of apostles." (Bible Dict., Vol. I., page 247.) The vacancies were filled as they occurred. The conclusion of Rev. Dr. Morgan Dix upon this is as follows : —

"Dr. Dix's theme was 'The Apostolical Succession,' in the elaboration of which he claimed that the long-hoped-for reunion of the different sects of Protestantism was impossible except by a denial of doctrines held essential by each, and expressed the hope that it would be brought about by the acceptance of the canons and doctrines of the Episcopal communion. Dr. Dix took for his text Acts i. 26: 'And they gave forth their lots; and the lot fell upon Matthias; and he was numbered with the eleven apostles.' He said: —

" 'When our Lord Jesus Christ gave orders to the apostles to go forth and convert the nations, he said, "I am with you

always, even unto the end of the world." It is plain that this promise was incapable of fulfilment unless in a line of successors, with whom from that day to the last Christ should be personally present. In the sacred college there was one vacant place; as a matter of course that place must be filled. The call of St. Matthias was therefore a critical event. It meant the continuance of the apostolic office; it was the beginning of an apostolic succession. It was the official interpretation of Christ's promise, and showed the way in which it was to be made good. If the apostolic office were not of divine origin, if it were not indispensable to carrying on the work of evangelization, the gap made by the traitor Judas need not have been stopped. If men could without commission have taken up the work which Christ had begun, if anybody and everybody who had a devout spirit and love of Christ could have evangelized without asking any one's leave or waiting for formal mission, the vacancy need not have been filled. That it was filled in that deliberate and solemn way shows that the office of apostle was to be a perpetual ordinance with the Lord, abiding in the church for all days unto the end of the world.' " — *New York Times*, Feb. 25, 1889.

It is insisted upon, however, by the would-be wise, that the apostles and prophets were placed in the church to continue only for a season, and then to cease because no longer needed. But notwithstanding this broad assumption, there is no evidence in the Bible to support it, and as little in reason and common-sense. It is purely a fiction of tradition.

Again it is said that when the New Testament was written the world had that to read, and, therefore, there was no more need of apostles and prophets in the church. What, then, became of the offices in the priesthood once occupied by this class of officers? Were they always to remain vacant? If so, why did

not Jesus or the apostles notify the church of that fact? And what made Paul say that they were to continue "till we all come in the unity of the faith"? (Eph. iv. 13.) These offices were filled in order that there might be a proper, live, active ministry to go forth in all the world and preach the gospel, and encourage and edify the great body of Christians. To argue that because we have the Bible to read, therefore there is no longer any need of this ancient order of things, is to say that the Bible has superseded the apostles in office, taken the place of the chief ministers. But does it say anywhere in the New Testament that God set Bibles in the church for the work of the ministry; or that he commissioned Bibles to go or be passed to the heathen solely in order to convert them? Does not the Bible rather define the duties and responsibilities of the ministers themselves?

With equal propriety the assumption might be made that after the law of Moses was written the priests and Levites could have been dispensed with as no longer needed; or that, when the Constitution of the United States was written, defining the powers and duties of the government officers, such as that of President, Vice-President, senator, etc., the officers could have been dispensed with as unnecessary; that there was nothing more that they could do; that the Constitution and constable were all the government the people needed.

The Constitution, indeed, defines the powers of the officers of the government, the manner of their choosing and appointment, and the duties, privileges, and respon-

sibilities of citizens. So long as we have a government constituted and carried on after this pattern, we will have the grand old Republic bequeathed to us by our fathers; but should it be changed from its constitutional form and provisions, it would cease to be the Republic, and be something else.

This is true of the kingdom of God, or the church of Jesus Christ.

In the New Testament there is a history given of the formation of the church of Christ in the times of the apostles. It sets forth the class of officers belonging thereto, and defines their duties. They were apostles, prophets, sevens, evangelists, elders, bishops, pastors, teachers, and deacons. Their respective duties and authority are clearly set out and defined. So long as there was an organization established according to this pattern, the church of Jesus Christ was upon earth. When it was changed from this pattern, it ceased to be his church and became something else.

To avoid imposition in finance, there is put in circulation a money test, by which the holder of money is enabled to determine whether there is tendered to him in exchange true or false coin. When every mark and figure on a coin or bill tendered in exchange harmonizes with the detector, it is pronounced good money. But if there is anything found on the coin or bill not to be found in the detector, or if there is something left out of the coin or bill that is found in the detector, it is rejected as spurious.

The New Testament contains the history of the formation of the primitive church; hence it is the test or

detector by which all church organizations, claiming to be the true, are to be tried. Every honest seeker after the church of God should expect to find an organization in harmony with its provisions, or he will fail to find the church of Christ. Should he become identified with another organization that is not according to this pattern, he will suffer himself to be imposed upon by that which is counterfeit, and, of course, in the end must meet with disappointment.

Then, friend, seeker, take the New Testament in your hand as your guide and test, by which to try systems, and start out and make search throughout Christendom and see how many churches may be found that will answer to the pattern, as being the church of Jesus Christ. Do not lose sight of the detector, or you will be in danger of being imposed upon by something man-made and spurious. The counterfeiter is abroad in the land.

## CHAPTER V.

**THE OFFICE OF THE CHIEF APOSTLE AND HIGH PRIEST THE SUPERIOR ONE IN THE CHURCH. — JESUS FILLED THIS OFFICE IN THE CHURCH WHILE ON EARTH. — HE WAS SUCCEEDED, AFTER HIS ASCENSION INTO HEAVEN, BY JAMES, THE LORD'S BROTHER.**

IN all earthly governments there is a supreme presiding head. In a republic, there is a president; in a kingdom, a king; in an empire, an emperor; in a dukedom, a duke; etc. This is true of ecclesiastical governments. In the Catholic Church, there is a pope; in the Episcopalian, a bishop; the Presbyterians have a presbytery; the Greek Church, a patriarch; Congregationalists have a pastor or pastors, etc.; but the church of Jesus Christ has a Chief Apostle and High Priest.

Both Jesus and John the Baptist were apostles in the commonly received sense of being *sent* upon their missions; but Jesus was an apostle in a still higher sense, not only in being sent, but by filling the chief apostolic office in the Melchisedec priesthood; hence, he is declared to be "the Apostle and High Priest." (Heb. iii. 1.)

Thousands flocked to the baptism of Jesus and John, and covenanted to follow in the ways of peace. A church soon began to be formed, and in due time it was completed. The order, as begun, was as follows:

(1.) Jesus "called unto him his disciples: and of them he chose twelve, whom also he named apostles." (Luke vi. 13.) (2.) He appointed "other seventy also." (Luke x. 1.) Then followed elders, pastors, evangelists, bishops, teachers, etc., in their order, as there was a demand for them. It was not until after the crucifixion and ascension of the Saviour that the organization was completed.

While the existence of these several offices in the priesthood, from that of an apostle to that of a deacon, may be conceded as having been the order of the primitive church, still is there an office belonging to the priesthood higher than those to which the twelve apostles were assigned? Jesus was not numbered with the twelve apostles, yet he was the chief presiding head of the church and ministry, "the Apostle and High Priest." Was he an Apostle and High Priest by virtue of filling such an office in the priesthood, or in some other way?

Before any person can become a priest, he must take upon him the priesthood, fill the priest's office. Jesus was not a high priest by reason of being the Son of God, but was made so by a call and an appointment. Paul says he was "called of God a high priest after the order of Melchisedec," the same as other high priests before him. For "in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren." (Heb. ii. 17.) "Christ glorified not himself to be made a high priest." (Heb. v. 5.) "And no man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron." Jesus said to John, "It becometh us to fulfil all right-



eousness." (Matt. iii. 15.) "Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God." (Heb. x. 7.) He always conformed to the established rules of law and order; not those set up by men, but those authorized of God. Hence he says, "He that is of God heareth God's words." (John viii. 47.) "I do always those things that please him." (John viii. 29.)

The institution under Moses, in general outline, was very similar to the one under Christ. Moses was the chief authority, the Melchisedec high priest, as has been shown in this article; then followed the twelve chiefs, or princes of the tribes; then the seventy elders (Num. i. 1-17; vii. 2-89; x. 4; xi. 16-31); after that, Aaron, priests, and Levites.

In the Christian system, Jesus is the chief apostle and Melchisedec high priest. Then follow the twelve apostles, then the seventy, then the elders; after that, bishops, teachers, and deacons; evangelists, pastors, and high priests, having their proper places assigned.

This order was in such perfect keeping with that of Moses, for which the Jews acknowledged a divine arrangement, that neither the enemies nor friends of Jesus ever made a criticism upon it. Under Moses, they were to become a "kingdom of priests," "a peculiar treasure unto me above all people." (Ex. xix. 5.) Under Christ they were "a royal priesthood"; "and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father." (Rev. i. 6; v. 10; 2 Peter ii. 5-9.)

But it is objected that because it is written, "He [Christ] continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priest-

hood," therefore no other priest could arise after that order.

The unsoundness of this position is shown by the fact that every priest of the order of Melchisedec "continueth ever." Paul says of Melchisedec, "He was made like unto the Son of God; abideth a priest continually." If, then, because one was made to "abide continually," there could, therefore, arise no more high priests of that order, then Jesus could not have been a Melchisedec high priest. For Melchisedec was before Christ, and Paul says he "abideth a priest continually." (Heb. vii. 3.)

Melchisedec and Moses were high priests of this unchangeable order of priesthood, and are high priests still in heaven. Jesus superseded them in this high office, while on earth, and now continues a High Priest in the heavens, by virtue (according to Paul) of the never-ending character and unchangeability of his priesthood.

Thus, as there have been high priests of this order who "continued ever," and who were superseded by other high priests of the same order and office, the precedent is established for an uninterrupted line of high priests on earth that "continueth ever." Therefore, the supposition that Jesus could not be superseded in the church on earth in the office of apostle and high priest, because he "abideth a priest continually," is proven a fallacy.

Again the question is renewed, Were the offices of the twelve apostles the highest positions in the church at the time of the Saviour's personal ministry? We answer emphatically, No.

In proof of this statement note what has previously been said in this article upon this point ; together with the following : —

“ And truly the Son of man goeth, as it was determined: but woe unto that man by whom he is betrayed! . . . And there was also a *strife among them, which of them should be accounted the greatest.*” — Luke xxii. 22, 24. “ There arose a reasoning among them, *which of them should be greatest.*” — Luke ix. 46. “ But they held their peace: for by the way they had disputed among themselves, who should be the greatest.” — Mark ix. 34.

The men who engaged in this strife already filled the twelve apostolic seats ; and if there was no higher office known to them in the priesthood and church to which they might aspire, why this strife as to who should be the greatest? Why contend for an impossible thing, one not in existence?

The proof here points out most certainly that there was a higher and more conspicuous office in the church than the ones filled by the twelve apostles, and that they knew it. They knew, also, that Jesus filled that office, and that at his decease he would be succeeded by another in the same office. Hence, when he informed them of the near approach of his death, the *strife began*. What for? Answer: The HIGHEST SEAT.

This seat must have been that of the chief “apostle and high priest,” for there is none other even hinted at in the Scriptures as being higher in any sense than the offices of the twelve apostles.

Jesus did not tell them that their aspirations were vain ; that there was no higher office in the kingdom of

God on earth than those to which they had already attained, to which they might legitimately aspire, and about which they contended; but the contrary of this, as follows:—

“And he said unto them, The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and they that exercise authority upon them are called benefactors. But ye shall not be so: but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is *chief*, as he that doth serve. For whether is greater, he that sitteth at meat, or he that serveth? is not he that sitteth at meat? but I am among you as he that serveth.”—Luke xxii. 25, 26, 27.

Here the Lord reminded the apostles how the Gentiles exercised lordship over the people, and informed them that it should not be so with them. But he that would be *chief*, should be as he that serveth. The greatest should not lord it over and domineer the rest, but serve as the younger. He himself had set the example, being among them as one that served.

Again:—

“Whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant.”—Matt. xx. 26.

“Whosoever of *you* will be the *chiefest*, shall be *servant of all*. For even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.”—Mark x. 44, 45.

These statements were made by the Saviour because of disputations having arisen among the twelve as to who should be the greatest when he should be removed. It is plainly announced “that the *chiefest*” should “be *servant of all*.”

Again : —

“Blessed are those servants, whom the lord when he cometh shall find watching: verily I say unto you, that he shall gird himself, and make them to sit down to meat, and will come forth and serve them.” — Luke xii. 37.

“And this know, that if the goodman of the house had known what hour the thief would come, he would have watched, and not have suffered his house to be broken through.” — Luke xii. 39.

“Then Peter said unto him, Lord, speakest thou this parable unto us, or even to all?

“And the Lord said, Who then is that faithful and wise steward, whom his lord shall make ruler over his household; to give them their portion of meat in due season?

“Blessed is that servant, whom his lord when he cometh shall find so doing.

“Of a truth I say unto you, that he will make him ruler over all that he hath.” — Luke xii. 41-44.

“Who then is a faithful and wise servant, whom his lord hath made ruler over his household, to give them meat in due season?

“Blessed is that servant, whom his lord when he cometh shall find so doing.

“Verily I say to you, That he shall make him ruler over all his goods.

“But and if that evil servant shall say in his heart, My lord delayeth his coming;

“And shall begin to smite his fellow servants, and to eat and drink with the drunken;

“The lord of that servant shall come in a day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware of,

“And shall cut him asunder, and appoint him his portion with the hypocrites: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.” — Matt. xxiv. 45-51.

These passages clearly indicate that there would be one appointed to the chief position in the Lord's house-

hold, "a faithful and wise servant." Luke calls him "a faithful and wise steward, whom his lord hath made ruler over his household."

The house of God is declared to be the church of God. Paul says : —

"If I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." — 1 Tim. iii. 15.

Says Peter : —

"Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house." — 1 Peter ii. 5.

Over this "house of God" there was to be appointed a chief "steward," "a faithful and wise servant," one called "great" or "greatest," "chief" or "chiefest," whose duty should be to serve all, give to them meat in due season.

This chief servant of *all*, who was appointed over the "house of God," was the successor of Jesus in the office of chief "apostle and high priest" in the church on earth.

Who was it that was thus preferred for this high position? Beyond question it was "James the Lord's brother." (Gal. i. 19.) The evidence points to him as having been the chief apostle and president of the church after the ascension of the Saviour into heaven.

James, the apostle, and son of Zebedee, was beheaded a few years after the ascension of the Saviour, and there is no evidence that either he or Peter or John ever held any position in the church other than that to which they were called in the time of the Saviour's

personal ministry; although they were of personal prominence among the apostles. Their authority and commission were to "all nations"; that of the chief "steward" or president was to the church. He was localized, occupied a central place. "Peter passed through all quarters." (Acts ix. 32.) James abode at Jerusalem. It was the seat of the first president, called by modern writers "bishop." That James held the chief authority is seen from a statement of Paul to the Galatians (ii. 9-12), as follows: "And when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship." James is here placed before Cephas and John, evidently because he held the chief authority or highest office.

It does not follow, because of the statement, "James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars," that these three belonged to the same quorum, or constituted a "presidency" who presided over the church. The personal prominence of two of those apostles, Cephas and John, before the crucifixion is strikingly indicated in the history given of the twelve in the gospels. Peter was the recognized leader among the apostles, and John was especially beloved by the Saviour; and there is nothing more natural than that the people should impose a trusted confidence in them not accorded to others, although but holding the same offices to which they were assigned when they were first called to the ministry. Together with James the son of Zebedee, they were prominent, and an especial confidence imposed in them before the crucifixion, and it is nothing sur-

prising that they should be considered "pillars" thereafter, although but holding the positions to which they were at first assigned. James, used in this connection, is James the Lord's brother, and was virtually unknown as a minister previous to the crucifixion; but here he is presented in a prominence equal to the chief and well-known apostles, and position must attach in his case and he be assigned as the chief apostle and president of the church, or as holding a position with the other apostles, including Peter and John, of whom he was chief. Again:—

"But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed. For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision."—Gal. ii. 11, 12.

This shows James to have been the chief director in church affairs, and that Peter changed his course towards the Gentiles, and honored James's counsel and decision, against the advice of Paul. Peter, on the night of his release from prison, said to those who were at prayer at the "house of Mary the mother of John," "Go shew these things unto James, and to the brethren." (Acts xii.17.) James is the only name mentioned in this connection, and doubtless it is because of the conspicuous position he held in the church. All others were included under the head of "the brethren." It would be natural to mention the chief church officials, if any, in sending tidings of this kind. James the son of Zebedee was beheaded at this time, and he could not have been the James referred to.



At a conference held at Jerusalem in which appeared the chief authorities of the church, James is presented as the conspicuous character, leader and president of that august assembly. After all had spoken, including Peter and Paul,

“James answered, saying, Men and brethren, hearken unto me.”

“Wherefore my sentence is, that we trouble not them, which from among the Gentiles are turned to God.” — Acts xv. 13, 19.

This decision pleased the whole assembly, and letters of congratulation and comfort were sent abroad to the several churches.

God recognized this chief presiding authority and indicated the decision. Hence we read: —

“For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things.” — Acts xv. 28.

There needs no comment upon this brief history to show that James was the chief authority and president of the church at this time, and that he presided and directed among the highest church dignitaries on one of the most important occasions of which history speaks. Again, after Paul, with others, had come on a long journey to Jerusalem, he says: —

“The brethren received us gladly.

“And the day following Paul went in with us unto James; and all the elders were present.” — Acts xxi. 17, 18.

James appears also in this narrative as the chief character, sitting with the elders at the seat of empire, the city of Jerusalem, not Rome. This James was doubtless the oldest son of Joseph and Mary by their

natural union, and he was slow to believe in the mission and claims of Jesus, as were the younger of the family, as is shown in the New Testament.

For when Jesus had come into his own country, it was said of him : —

“ Whence hath this man this wisdom, and these mighty works?

“ Is not this the carpenter’s son? is not his mother called Mary, and his brethren, James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas?

“ And his sisters, are they not all with us? ” — Matt. xiii. 54, 55, 56.

This is a decisive statement in favor of James, Joses, Simon, and Judas being the brethren of the Lord. Some adverse criticisms have been made upon it, however, by some writers, but it is affirmed by the larger number.

After the resurrection, Jesus appeared unto James. (1 Cor. xv. 7.) Some writers have concluded that this marks the beginning of a complete confidence and faith of James in the character and mission of Christ. But it is only conjecture, as it is founded upon no historical fact.

The statement, “ Neither did his brethren believe in him ” (John vii. 5), was made in the early part of the Saviour’s ministry, and does not necessarily commit the four brothers, as there were a number of other relatives, brethren, that this could aptly refer too, and still allow that these were even at that time converts to the faith. But allowing that they were then doubtful, there was ample time for conversion before the crucifixion.

Dr. Wm. Smith says : —

“At some time in the forty days that intervened between the resurrection and the ascension the Lord appeared to him [James]. This is not related by the Evangelists, but it is mentioned by St. Paul. (1 Cor. xv. 7.) Again we lose sight of James for ten years, and when he appears once more it is in a far higher position than any that he has yet held. In the year 37 occurred the conversion of Saul. Three years after his conversion he paid his first visit to Jerusalem, but the Christians recollected what they had suffered at his hands, and feared to have anything to do with him. Barnabas, at this time of far higher reputation than himself, took him by the hand, and introduced him to Peter and James (Acts ix. 27; Gal. i. 18, 19), and by their authority he was admitted into the society of the Christians, and was allowed to associate freely with them during the fifteen days of his stay. Here we find James on a level with Peter, and with him deciding on the admission of St. Paul into fellowship with the church at Jerusalem; and from henceforth we always find him equal, or in his own department superior, to the very chiefest apostles, Peter, John, and Paul. For by this time he had been appointed to preside over the infant church in its most important centre. . . . This pre-eminence is evident throughout the after history of the apostles, whether we read it in the Acts, in the epistles, or in ecclesiastical writers.” — *Bible Dictionary*, page 237.

According to the statements of this learned writer, Paul was converted to the Christian cause in “the year 37.” Three years after (in 40) he “went up to Jerusalem to see Peter.” Here he was introduced by Barnabas “to the apostles.” Yet all the apostles that he met were James and Peter. This shows James to have then been an apostle. (Acts ix. 27; Gal. i. 18.)

James, the apostle, and son of Zebedee, was put to death in A. D. 44. Thus we find James, “the Lord’s

brother," an apostle, and "*we always find him equal, or in his own department superior, to the very chiefest apostles, Peter, John, and Paul,*" while yet all of the twelve apostles were alive. "*For by this time*" (before any of the original twelve had deceased, except Judas Iscariot) "*he had been appointed to PRESIDE OVER THE INFANT CHURCH.*" "*This PRE-EMINENCE is evident throughout the after history of the apostles, whether we read it in the Acts, in the epistles, or in ecclesiastical writers.*" Here it is declared that James, the Lord's brother, was appointed the president of the church at Jerusalem, and made "superior to the very chiefest apostles." He was the person, then, who, by due appointment and the common consent of the church, succeeded to the office of the chief apostle and high priest in the church on earth, soon after the ascension of the Saviour into heaven.

Further: —

"He remained unmolested (at Jerusalem), the apostles being scattered, and from this time he is the acknowledged head of the church of Jerusalem. A consideration of Acts xii. 17; xv. 13, 19; xxi. 18; Gal. ii. 2, 9, 12, will remove all doubts on this head. Indeed, four years before Herod's persecution, he had stood, it would seem, on a level with Peter (Gal. i. 18, 19; Acts ix. 27), and it has been thought that he received special instruction for the functions which he had to fulfil from the Lord himself. (1 Cor. xv. 7; Acts i. 3.) Whatever his pre-eminence was, he appears to have borne no special title indicating it. The example of the mother church of Jerusalem was again followed by the Pauline churches. Timothy and Titus had probably had no distinctive title, but it is impossible to read the epistles addressed to them without seeing that they had an authority superior to that of the ordinary bishops or priests,

with regard to whose conduct and ordination St. Paul gives them instruction. (1 Tim. iii.; v. 17, 19; Titus i. 5.)" — *Bible Dictionary*, Vol. I., page 455.

It would seem to be a wiser conclusion, that, accepting that the above-mentioned officers held an authority superior to others of the ministry, there were some terms in use which indicated those positions, well known to the church then, but lost to history since, as many other things have been, obscured and lost under the workings and rule of the "mystery of iniquity." Were these men seventies, high priests, evangelists, pastors, apostles? What? The scholastics do not know, hence they conclude, as the best way out of the difficulty, that they had no distinctive titles.

Says Hegesippus : —

"With the apostles, James, the brother of the Lord, succeeds to the charge of the church, — that James, who has been called Just from the time of the Lord to our days, for there were many of the name James. He was holy from his mother's womb; he drank not wine or strong drink, nor did he eat animal food." — *Bible Dictionary*, Vol. I., page 1206.

Again : —

"For the church of Jerusalem, James, the Lord's brother, was first bishop thereof, as all ancient writers agree; though when and by whom he was ordained they are not so unanimous; for some say by the apostles, after our Lord's crucifixion; others, by Christ himself; and others, again, both by Christ and the apostles. . . . This was designed as a peculiar honor to St. James, as the brother of Christ; for though our Saviour usually gave preference to Peter, John, and James, his brother, yet none of those contended about this honor, but chose this James to be bishop." — *Christian Antiquities*, by BINGHAM, Vol. I., page 16.

“James was president of the church at Jerusalem.” — *Biblical Cyclopædia*; Vol. II., page 681.

Again : —

“The question respecting the identity of the James who wrote this Epistle [the Epistle of James] is one of great difficulty. That James, the Lord’s brother, whom Paul names as one of the apostles (Gal. i. 19), is identical with the James mentioned by Luke in Acts xii. 17; xv. 13, and was the author of the present Epistle, is admitted by most writers. That this James was the James who was named with Joses, Simon, and Judas, as one of our Lord’s brethren, must be received as certain. But whether he was identical with James, the son of Alphæus, who was one of the twelve, is a question much discussed, and on which eminent Biblical scholars are found arrayed on opposite sides. The author of this Epistle is, beyond all reasonable doubt, the James who gave the final opinion in the assembly of the apostles and elders at Jerusalem (Acts xv. 15-21), whom Paul named, with Cephas and John, as one of the ‘pillars,’ and who elsewhere appears as a man of commanding influence in the church at Jerusalem; also called James the Just.” — *Pictorial Bible* (which includes the Revised Version), page 42, and published at Chicago, Ill., by David C. Cook & Co., 46 Adams Street \*

Did James preside over the church by virtue of being appointed to a proper office in the priesthood, or in some other way? Did the apostles meet together and invent a new thing, — set a president over the “house of God,” without any authority or precedent for it? Answer you who may, who doubt that James, the Lord’s brother (or some other, not to appear dogmatic upon that which has not obtained universal consent), succeeded to office in the Melchisedec priesthood, occupied the high seat held by Melchisedec and Moses.

## CHAPTER VI.

**THE PRESIDENT OF THE CHURCH CONTINUED. — HE HAD TWO COUNSELLORS. MOST LIKELY JUDE AND SILAS, OR JUDAS. — JAMES, THE SON OF ZEBEDEE, PETER, AND JOHN WERE NOT CONSTITUTED A FIRST PRESIDENCY OVER THE ENTIRE CHURCH. — PETER THE PRESIDENT OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES. — THE CARDINAL PRINCIPLES OF THE FAITH. — THE LAWS OF INITIATION INTO THE CHURCH.**

ACCEPTING that James was made president of the church, it would be reasonable to conclude that he was aided by counsellors, — any way, by as many as two. This would be the least number that could properly constitute a committee or quorum in order to obtain a majority decision in the transaction of business. Following in the line and order of an ascending authority, from the body of elders to that of the seventy, and thence to the twelve apostles, it would be natural to conclude that a quorum of not more than three would be appointed to constitute a presidency. Upon questions to be considered and decided this would give a majority of one, and it would be unreasonable to conclude that there were no arduous labor to be performed and important transactions to be considered in connection with this high and responsible position that would demand aid, counsel, and decision. For this number we have a type or example given in the time of Moses, as follows : —

“But Moses’ hands were heavy; and they took a stone, and put it under him, and he sat thereon; and Aaron and Hur stayed up his hands, the one on the one side, and the other on the other side; and his hands were steady until the going down of the sun.” — Ex. xvii. 12; xxiv. 14.

This was before Aaron was consecrated to the “priest’s office,” or the order of things under the Levitical priesthood, over which Aaron presided, was set up. Again, the church on earth was after the pattern of the heavenly; three presiding on earth in the likeness of the three presiding in heaven, — the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

Now, that this is the order of the kingdom of God, was well understood by the wife of Zebedee, who was instructed personally by the Saviour in the order of the church. Hence her ambition led her to take her two sons, James and John, to the Saviour, and ask of him that they might “sit, the one on thy right hand, and the other on the left, in thy kingdom.” (Matt. xx. 21.) Mark says, as expressed by the two sons, “in thy glory.” (Mark x. 37.) This was to be in the future, when the kingdom of Christ would bear rule over all the earth, when he comes in the glory of his Father. (Mark viii. 38; Matt. xxiv. 30; xvi. 27; Mark xii. 26.) “Then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory.” (Matt. xxv. 31.)

At this time, the twelve apostles had already received the promise to “sit upon twelve thrones” when Christ should “sit in the throne of his glory.” (Matt. xix. 28; Luke xxii. 29; Rev. xx. 4.)

These two sons were included with the other ten



apostles, heirs to the same promise of sitting upon thrones. But it did not quite satisfy the ambition of this proud Jewess; she craved that her two sons should sit, the one on his right hand, and the other on his left, in his kingdom. This simply meant that she wished them placed in the two seats of honor or power, — those nearest his person.

Unwise as this request may have been, the Saviour never informed the woman that there were no such positions to be filled in his kingdom as these two sons seem to have aspired to; but he rather confirmed her opinion of the matter by saying, "To sit on my right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give, *but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared of my Father.*" (Matt. xx. 23.)

The order of the kingdom of God, and its future prevalence on the earth, were such common topics of conversation and discourse in those days, and were so well understood, that the thief on the cross was informed regarding it, and while expiring craved that Christ would remember him when He should come in His kingdom. "Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom." (Luke xxiii. 42.) This thief was, doubtless, a baptized disciple of Christ, but while under temptation had sinned, and Christ here forgave him. (1 John ii. 1.)

The angel said to Mary, "The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David." (Luke i. 32.)

As to the two persons who were associated with the Apostle James in the presidency of the church, it should be no surprise if their names are not mentioned in the

history of the church ; for James, the president, even, is lost sight of for a period of ten years, and some of the most important things relating to him were but incidentally mentioned, as it were, by the historian. Indeed, we have but a scrap of the history of those times. Persecution, war, conflict, and destruction were the common order. Peter's name even is not mentioned for a period of six years, — one of the first and most popular of the apostles.

The best evidence obtainable, however, points to the Apostle Jude as being one that was associated with the president of the church. (1.) It is conceded that he was an apostle. (2.) It is agreed that he was the brother of James ; hence the prestige of family that would be likely to secure respect and confidence. (3.) The manner in which he addressed his Epistle shows him to have been in high standing, influential, and well known by all of the church. He had but to say that he was the "brother of James" to indicate his standing and secure regard for his Epistle throughout the entire church. (4.) His letter is addressed to the church at large. This he would not have done had he not been occupying one of the highest seats in the church, — one near the president. It reads : "To them that are sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ." Not to one church, but to them all. Again : "When I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation." . . . "For there are certain men crept in unawares." This shows him to have been a chief watchman, and well informed in church matters. (5.) In the seventeenth verse he dis-

claims a standing, it would seem, with the twelve apostles, hence the proper place to assign him is with his brother James in the presidency of the church.

Under the heading of the "Epistle of Jude" we have the following:—

"The writer of the Epistle styles himself (verse one) 'Jude, the . . . brother of James,' and has been usually identified with the Apostle Judas Lebbaeus, or Thaddeus. But there are strong reasons for rendering the words, 'Judas, the . . . son of James'; and inasmuch as the author appears (verse seventeen) to distinguish himself from the apostles, we may agree with eminent critics in attributing the Epistle to another author. The most probable conclusion is that the author was Jude, one of the brethren of Jesus; not the apostle, the son of Alphæus, but the bishop of Jerusalem." — *Pictorial Bible*, published by D. Cook & Co., Chicago, Ill., page 47.\*

As to who the other assistant or counsellor was, it is yet more doubtful. It is highly probable, however, that it was Silas; possibly "Judas, surnamed Barsabas." (Acts xv. 22, 27, 32.) More than likely, as these were times of fierce persecution, and many of the chief Christian workers lost their lives, these counsellors, or aids, were frequently removed by death and others assigned to their places. None ever exerted the influence over the Jews, as such, as did James. He was highly esteemed by all classes by reason of his well-known great piety. The Jews hoped, or sought, until the last, the day of his martyrdom, to reclaim him from the Christian cause. By reason of the popular regard had for him, it appears that he was protected in Jerusalem when the twelve apostles were scattered abroad, together with many of the church.

It is believed by some that, after the crucifixion of the Saviour, Peter, James, and John were advanced to the presidency of the church; that their authority henceforth transcended that of the other apostles. But unfortunately for this theory, there seems to be little or nothing to support it.

(1.) All the facts go to show that it was James, the "Lord's brother," and not James, the son of Zebedee, that was made president of the church at Jerusalem.

(2.) There is no evidence showing that either Peter or John ever acted in that capacity, but rather that they continued in the very offices and authority to which they were appointed when they were first called to the apostleship by the Master.

It is argued, however, that the Saviour said unto Peter: "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (Matt. xvi. 19), and that this was virtually his appointment to the leadership or presidency of the church.

But there is nothing conferred in this statement that is not essential to the carrying out of the great commission given to Peter and co-laborers, to go and "teach all nations, baptizing them," etc. (Matt. xxviii. 19.) From the very choosing of the twelve apostles Peter seems to have been constituted their leader. The reason is not assigned, but he does not appear to have been any more so after than before the crucifixion.

Dr. Smith says of him:—

“From this time [the time of the choosing of the apostles] there can be no doubt that Peter held the first place among the apostles, to whatever cause his precedence is to be attributed. He is named first in every list of the apostles; he is generally addressed by our Lord as their representative; and on the most solemn occasions he speaks in their name.” (See John vi. 66-69; Matt. xvi. 16, 18.)

“The early church regarded St. Peter generally . . . as the representative of the apostolic body; a very distinct theory from that which makes him their head or governor in Christ’s stead. Peter held no distinct office, and certainly never claimed any distinct powers which did not belong equally to all his fellow-apostles.” — *Bible Dictionary*, page 427.

The evidence points to Peter as the chairman or president of the college of apostles, rather than anything else; and this it is most likely he was, both before and after the ascension of the Saviour. There was nothing in the “keys” of authority conferred upon him that was not essential to the office which he held both before and after the crucifixion; indeed, belongs to it.

Peter exercised this authority on Pentecost, and at the house of Cornelius. He received from heaven, and unlocked to men on earth. It was essential to his ministry as a chief apostle in all the world. It belongs to the office of an apostle, most especially to the chief of that body or quorum. Had Peter been regarded in the light of the president of the church, the church at Jerusalem would not have brought him up so summarily for his conduct at the house of Cornelius; neither would Paul have likely found out more of the truth of the divine will than he, and so contend against him “because he was to be blamed.” (Gal. ii. 11.) Upon this point it is but necessary to call the attention of

those who believe as does the writer, to the authorization of the ministry in this Latter-day Dispensation, in order to convince them of this position; for an equal authority — seems to have been the exact one — was conferred upon Thomas B. Marsh, the president of the twelve, as follows: —

“Verily I say unto you, my servant Thomas, thou art the man whom I have chosen to hold the keys of my kingdom (as pertaining to the twelve) abroad among all nations, that thou mayest be my servant to unlock the door of the kingdom in all places,” etc.

“For unto you (the twelve), and those (the first presidency) who are appointed with you to be your counsellors and leaders, is the power of this priesthood given for the last days and the last time.” — *Covenants and Commandments*, Section 105, paragraphs 7 and 12.

Here the presidency and twelve are associated together in holding “the power of this priesthood given for the last time.” The “keys” of the kingdom abroad among all nations were conferred upon the president of the twelve, and this did not interfere in the least with the high authority, prerogatives, and “keys” conferred upon the president of the church and associates, who not only preside over the whole church, but become the leaders and counsellors of the quorum of apostles in their specific work to all nations. The following sets forth the high and distinguishing prerogatives, in contradistinction to all others, of the first president: —

“And, again, the duty of the president of the office of the high priesthood is to preside over the whole church, and to be like unto Moses. Behold, here is wisdom: yea, to be a seer, a revelator, a translator, and a prophet, having all the gifts of

God which he bestows upon the head of the church." — *Covenants and Commandments*, Section 64, paragraph 42.

The duties and privileges of the counsellors are very similar to those of the president; *i. e.*, to aid and assist in any matters connected with his high office.

This, too, is in harmony with what is written in the "Book of Covenants and Commandments," Section 6, as follows: —

"I will make him [John] as a flame of fire and a ministering angel; he shall minister for those who shall be heirs of salvation who dwell on the earth; and I will make thee [Peter] to minister for him and thy brother James; and unto you three I will give this power and the keys of this ministry until I come."

"Unto you three I will give this power and the keys of this ministry until I come." What ministry? To preside over the whole church? No. It was the ministry for the proclamation of the gospel to "all the world." John's especial request was that "power over death" should be given him, to the end that he might continue in "this ministry" and "bring souls unto" Christ. His request was granted, and it was said to him: "Thou shalt tarry until I come in my glory, and shalt prophesy before nations, kindreds, tongues, and people." Imbued with a proper love of mankind, and a true missionary spirit, his appointment abroad to the great world is here confirmed, not to a seat or presidency at a centre, but to *all* nations. (Rev. x. 11.)

Peter desired that he "might speedily come" into Christ's kingdom. Both of their requests were granted. James, it appears, made no request. The three were united in the work of the ministry, and it was to them

that it was said : "Unto you three I will give this power and the keys of this ministry until I come"; that is, to go and teach all the nations.

"I will make thee [Peter] to minister for him [John] and thy brother James."

There is nothing in this specific statement concerning Peter not to be found in substance in the Gospels. As it is well expressed by Dr. Smith, that, from the choosing of the apostles, "Peter held the first place among them." "He is generally addressed by our Lord as their representative." "He speaks in their name." He is here confirmed in his old station, not only as chief or spokesman among the twelve apostles, but also of the three. "I will make thee to minister for him [John] and thy brother James." This recognized leadership of Peter in the quorum of apostles is acknowledged both before the crucifixion and after, — on the day of Pentecost, at the house of Cornelius, down at Samaria, at the conference at Jerusalem, and is here confirmed for all time.

The sending of Peter with an especial message to Cornelius was not because he was the president of the church, as is virtually confessed by Peter himself at the council at Jerusalem. Said he : —

"Men and brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel and believe." — Acts xv. 7.

This shows that the Almighty made a special "choice" of Peter from among others to go on this mission, and it argues nothing for the claim that he was sent be-



cause he was the president of the church, and that it was his right because of his holding the "keys" of the highest office, or that he was the only one who held "keys" and authority.

But the James spoken of and included with Peter and John in the above, is not James, the Lord's brother, who presided at Jerusalem, but James, the son of Zebedee. The keys and authority for proclaiming the gospel to the nations were conferred upon these until Christ should come. But James, the Lord's brother, was appointed to preside at Jerusalem. So that, in the opening of this last dispensation, — the "dispensation of the fulness of times," — Peter, James, and John — the council to whom was committed the authority to preach the gospel to all nations — appeared and conferred the priesthood, and the keys thereof, in order properly to qualify a ministry to declare the restored gospel, — the great latter-day message. This was James, the son of Zebedee, John, and Peter, — Peter still continuing the chief minister of the three.

This is in accord with the statement : —

"Verily I say unto you, my servant Thomas, thou art the man whom I have chosen to hold the keys of my kingdom (as pertaining to the twelve) abroad among all nations." — *Covenants and Commandments*, Section 105, paragraphs 6, 7; Section 104, paragraphs 11, 12, and 42.

Again, it could scarcely be consistently held by a people who believe that the Melchisedec priesthood is a lineal priesthood, descending from father to son, that on the ascension of the Saviour into heaven the priesthood was transferred from the house of Joseph to the

house of Zebedee, and that, too, when it is known that the kindred of Jesus were in the faith and devoted to the great cause which he established. Of right, it belonged to the house of Joseph, and James being the eldest, after Jesus, of that family, save only for transgression Jehovah even could not bar him of his right, for God cannot do unjustly.

“The order of this priesthood was confirmed to be handed down from father to son, and rightly belongs to the literal descendants of the chosen seed to whom the promises were made. This order was instituted in the days of Adam, and came down by lineage in the following manner: From Adam to Seth, etc.” — *Covenants and Commandments*, Section 104, paragraph 18; Section 83, paragraph 2.

“The language of the New Testament writers, in relation to the priesthood,” says Dr. Smith, “ought not to be passed over. They recognized in Christ the first-born, the king, the anointed, the representative of the true primeval priesthood after the order of Melchisedec.” — *Bible Dictionary*, page 446.

In this opinion, the lineage — right of the first-born — is recognized, indicating that the house of Joseph was in the true lineal line which had been “hid with Christ in God.”

This lineal right was recognized after the ascension of the Saviour, and the chief authority remained in the house of Joseph, and hence James and associates presided over the whole church, while Peter held “the keys” of the kingdom (as pertaining to the twelve), and presided in that council or quorum, and these two quorums jointly held the chief authority, and governed the church at home and abroad.

The twelve apostles, then, were true to the com-

mission given them. They went *into all the world*, — Peter included. James presided at Jerusalem.

“For nothing is plainer,” says Rev. J. W. Harding, D. D., “than that St. James, the apostle (whom St. Paul calls ‘our Lord’s brother,’ and reckons with Peter and John one of the pillars of the church), was the same who presided among the apostles, doubtless by virtue of his episcopal office, and determined the cause in the synod of Jerusalem. He was preferred before all the rest for his near relationship to Christ.” — *Sacred Biography and History*, page 522.

As further evidence upon the question as to who was constituted the president of the church at Jerusalem, the following is submitted : —

“James, the Lord’s brother, was bishop of Jerusalem (compare Gal. xix. with Gal. ii. 9–12), and was president of the church in its earliest days. (Acts xii. 13; xv. 18.) Such a position required him to be a resident of Jerusalem. . . . He simply styles himself in the introduction thereto [of his Epistle] ‘a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ.’ He who could thus write with the certainty of being identified must have been the most famous person of his name in the church; must have been what St. Paul, in a passage (Gal. ii. 9) where he places James both before Peter and John, calls him ‘a pillar’ of the Christian society. And, again, Jude, when commencing his Epistle, calls himself the brother of James, with no other mark of distinction. Here, too, the same James must be intended; and when we read St. Jude’s Epistle (17, 18) we find him distinguishing himself from the apostles, and as it were disclaiming apostolic dignity [one of the twelve]. This is as it would be if James and Jude were both brethren of the Lord, and were not apostles; but we should certainly expect one or the other would have left some indication in their letters had they been of the number of the twelve, and most surely neither of them would have been likely to give us reason to believe that he was not an apostle. . . . Once more: The brethren of the Lord are expressly said

(John vii. 5) not to have believed on Jesus at a period much later in his ministry than the appointment of the twelve, while in the mention of them in Acts i. 14, there is given first a list of the eleven who are said to have continued in prayer with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren. Such a studied severance of the brethren of the Lord from the number of the apostles is very significant, while the position that they held in the list may well be due to the fact that it was only at a late period that they had become disciples of Jesus. The change in their opinions has been thought by many to be sufficiently accounted for by the statement of St. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 7), that after his resurrection Jesus 'was seen of James.' — *Encyclopædia Britannica*, page 562.

Eusebius, in the second book of his "Ecclesiastical History," page 1, writes of the course that was pursued by the apostles after the ascension of the Saviour, as follows : —

• "First, in the place of Judas, the traitor, Matthias was chosen by lot. . . . Then were appointed, with prayer and imposition of hands, approved men unto the office of deacons. Then James, called the brother of our Lord, . . . whom the ancients, on account of the excellence of his virtue, surnamed 'the Just,' was the first to receive the episcopate of the church at Jerusalem. But Clement (who was the companion of St. Paul), in the sixth book of his 'Institutions,' represents it thus: 'Peter and James and John, after the ascension of our Saviour, though they had been preferred by our Lord, did not contend for the honor as to who should occupy the highest seat, but chose James the Just as bishop of Jerusalem.'"

The same author, in the seventh book of the same work, writes : —

"The Lord imparted the gift of knowledge to James the Just, to John and Peter, after his resurrection; these delivered it to the rest of the apostles, and they to the seventy, of whom Barnabas was one.

“But James, the brother of the Lord, who, as there were many of his name, was surnamed the Just by all from the days of our Lord until now, received the government of the church with the apostles.” — *History*, by EUSEBIUS, page 76.

“First, they slew Stephen by stoning; next James, the brother of John and son of Zebedee, by beheading; and, finally, James, who first obtained the episcopal seat at Jerusalem, after the ascension of our Saviour.” — EUSEBIUS, page 86.

“For the church at Jerusalem, it is unanimously delivered by all ancient writers, that James, the Lord’s brother, was the first bishop thereof.” — BINGHAM.\*

“He was ordained by the apostles immediately after our Lord’s crucifixion.” — ST. JEROME.

These witnesses all unite in giving a like testimony, showing that there was a president in the church at Jerusalem, who was not of the number of the twelve apostles, and that it was “James, the Lord’s brother.”

As a second step in the order of succession, the following occurs in the writings of Clemens, who was one of the most ancient of writers of church history : —

“That this was designed as a peculiar honor to St. James, in regard that he was the brother of Christ. . . . Some time after his death, as Eusebius relates from ancient tradition, the apostles and disciples of our Lord, as many as were yet in being, met together with our Saviour’s kinsmen (several of whom were yet alive) to consult about choosing a successor in St. James’s room, and they unanimously agreed upon Simeon, son of Cleopas, our Saviour’s cousin according to the flesh, thinking him the most fit and worthy person.” — *Antiquities of Christianity*, page 58. (See also “Christian Antiquities,” by Bingham, Vol. I., page 16.)

Again : —

“There were yet living (A. D. 100) of the family of our Lord, the grandchildren of Judas (Jude), called the brother of our

Lord according to the flesh. . . . They ruled the churches, both as witnesses and relatives of the Lord." — EUSEBIUS, *Ecclesiastical History*, XX. 1.

These citations of history from the writings of the early Fathers, some of whom were contemporaneous with the apostles themselves, confirm the position taken, that James, "the Lord's brother," succeeded Jesus in the high office of chief "apostle and high priest" in the Melchisedec priesthood on earth, and that, too, by an agreement had between the apostles themselves. That, notwithstanding the contention had by the twelve previous to the crucifixion as to who should be the greatest when the Saviour should be taken away, James was appointed to the office of "chief steward," and presided over the entire church. That the apostles sustained him in that position. They "contended not as to who should occupy the highest seat, but *chose James*."

There is an office, therefore, in the order of the church established by Christ higher than those of the twelve apostles, which they respected, and by unanimous consent appointed a most fit person to occupy that position.

We have, then, as set out in the institution of Moses, —

(1.) The Melchisedec and the Aaronic priesthoods, Moses being the chief apostle and high priest and prophet or *president*, supported by two aids, — Aaron and Hur.

(2.) Twelve princes, chiefs of the tribes.

(3.) The seventy elders.

(4.) Aaron, officiating in "the priest's office," as the high priest of the Levitical order.

(5.) The lesser priests and Levites, etc.

Under Christ, as set out in the New Testament, there were committed the Melchisedec and the Aaronic priest-hoods, with —

(1.) Jesus as "the apostle and high priest" and prophet.

(2.) He was succeeded in office, in the church militant, by James, "the Lord's brother," who was aided by two assistants, who were, in all probability, Jude and Silas.

(3.) The quorum of the twelve apostles.

(4.) The seventy elders.

(5.) The elders.

(6.) Bishops.

(7.) Priests.

(8.) Teachers.

(9.) Deacons.

(10.) High priests, evangelists, and pastors, set in their respective places, whose exact positions, in point of preferment, are not definitely set forth in the Bible.

The fundamental doctrines believed in and taught by this Jerusalem church were: (1.) Faith in God. (2.) Faith in Jesus Christ. (3.) In the Holy Ghost. (4.) Belief in the doctrine of repentance. (5.) In baptism. (6.) In the laying on of hands. (7.) In the resurrection of the dead; and (8.) Eternal judgment. (9.) The Lord's supper. (10.) The washing of feet. These, together with an humble and godly walk, including all of the excellences set out in the moral code, with the endowment of the Holy Ghost as realized and enjoyed in the testimony of Jesus,—such as faith, wisdom,

knowledge, dreams, prophecies, tongues, interpretations, visions, healings, etc., — were some of the chief or cardinal things belonging to the “house of God,” as set up by Christ, and made the “light of the world,” the “pillar and ground of the truth.” This was the heritage bequeathed by Christ and the apostles and saints to the world in their day, and which was to be perpetuated so long as a proper faith and commendable purity should attach to those professing a belief therein.

The laws of initiation into this church fold were beautifully set out on the day of Pentecost by the Apostle Peter while addressing a congregation of Jews, who became convicted of their transgressions, — “pricked in their heart,” — and cried, “Men and brethren, what shall we do?” “Repent,” said the apostle, “and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.” (Acts ii. 38, 39.) (See also Chap. viii. 12; xxii. 16; x. 47, 48; xvi. 15; viii. 38; xix. 5, 6; Heb. vi. 2.)



## CHAPTER VII.

### THE VIRGIN CHURCH. — THE RISE AND PREVALENCE OF THE MAN OF SIN, OR MYSTERY, BABYLON.

THIS beautiful organization of the church of Jesus Christ is most strikingly represented in her replete, heaven-approved, and chaste state, by John the Revelator, under the figure of a woman "clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars." (Rev. xii. 1.)

The woman symbolized the church in its primitive and pure state; the moon under her feet represented that the lesser glory (the law) had passed away, — was no longer in force. The church of Christ stood above it, for the glory of the law was as the light of the moon compared with that of the sun in the distinction between the law and the gospel. The perfect law of liberty (the gospel) having been established, the law of Moses (the "schoolmaster," the imperfect code) is shown to be inoperative, null, and void.

Being clothed with the sun emblemized the glory, power, inspiration, light, and knowledge with which the church was endowed by Jesus Christ, its great Head, being illuminated and glorified with his presence, authority, and inspiration.

"For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell." — Col. i. 19.

“And gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body.” — Eph. i. 22, 23.

“Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular.” 1 Cor. xii. 27.

To be “clothed” upon, in a gospel sense, is to be adorned with commendable graces; so we read:—

“And to her was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white: for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints.” — Rev. xix. 8.

The sun being the great centre of the solar system, around which the planets and worlds revolve in their order and succession, and from which they receive their light and heat and life, it is a most beautiful and fitting representation of that effulgence and power with which the church was endowed by the Sun of Righteousness, the great centre of the Christian system, and who is its true light and life and inspiration. The twelve stars that adorned her head represented the twelve apostles, or apostolic seats, which were her diadem of authority, by which she was to be represented to the nations of the earth, and built up a “glorious church.” They were to continue “till we all come in the unity of the faith.” (Eph. iv. 13.)

This church, as represented, was the messenger of the new covenant to proclaim peace and glad tidings among men, — God’s constituted order and authority for the enlightenment and salvation of the world. Thus clothed and crowned, she was commissioned for all time, if loyal to her great Head, to extend her banner — the gospel of peace — wherever the sons of men chose to dwell. She was admonished, however, to guard

against worldly vices and influences, and to hold on to her exalted standing and beautiful graces ; otherwise God would take away her magnificent adornings, withdraw the power and glory of his presence, remove her crown of authority, reject and leave her despoiled of her enchanting beauty, to become a wanderer in exile, and to mingle with the follies, sins, and pleasures of the world.

Was she constant, pure, and faithful to her appointment that all might recognize her by her beautiful raiment ? Did she carefully guard her person against all the encroachments of vice and immorality, resist the temptations of the world and the seductive influences and wiles of the wicked one ? No. Notwithstanding her great endowment of power, beauty, and inspiration, she was yet a probationer. Her pathway led along by the world's great pleasures and beside the camp of the cruel and the wicked. She was circumvented on every hand, and subjected to all of the embarrassments, temptations, and enticements common to earth life. Superstition, idolatry, bigotry, intolerance, and enthroned tyranny conspired against her, and proud ambition sought her overthrow. Though powerful and capable if she but willed, she was not constant. In an evil hour, through the infatuations and deceivableness of the world, she was allured from her exalted station, and sinned and fell ; and God took away her beautiful dress ; tore off her crown of authority ; took away the glory, power, and inspiration that made her the light of the world and of chief worth to men ; and she was left to wander in exile, in blindness, uncertainty,

and doubt in the wilderness of sin. The "great red dragon" cast "water as a flood after the woman" (the fierce persecutions of the uncircumcised), and she was driven into the wilderness. (Rev. xii. 3, 15, 16.) "Her child was caught up unto God, and to his throne." (Rev. xii. 5.) This represented the priesthood or — "kingdom of God." (Inspired translation, verse seven.) "The kingdom of God is not in word, but in power." (1 Cor. iv. 20.)

Divested of her power and rejected of God, like Saul under sin, she courted the power, friendship, and inspiration of the world, and by and by she is seen transformed and exhibited in a proud, haughty, and unchaste state upon a hydra-headed horned beast, as follows: —

"So he carried me away in the spirit into the wilderness: and I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet colored beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns. And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet color, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication: and upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH." — Rev. xvii. 3, 4. 5.

What an amazing contrast is this to her original splendor, glory, and beauty! How changed in her habilaments! How she is fallen! No longer the sun adorns her person, or a crown of stars her head; no longer the pure and chaste virgin of primitive days, when James, Peter, John, Paul, Matthew, and others were honored with seats in her crown of authority; but gold now, and pearls, and precious stones, and scarlet are

her adornings, with a golden cup in her hand "full of her abominations." In this awful, degenerate, polluted, and diabolical state she sits as empress of the kings of the earth. (Rev. xvii. 18.) "Eyes like the eyes of a man" were given her for her light, "and a mouth speaking great things" as her lawgiver. (Dan. vii. 8.) She assumed to herself the right to universal empire, seized the realm of state, and arrogated the proud title of "infallibility."

Historians writing of the reign of this queen of vice and usurpation, intolerance, and crime, present such a fearful picture of the depravity of man that to read it is to be shocked, amazed, confounded at the awful wickedness of the human heart and cruelty of human kind. Rivers of blood flowed, the consciences of men were proscribed, their bodies tortured and burned under the merciless and vile rule of this "MOTHER OF HARLOTS."

No wonder the Saviour declared, by the unerring foresight of his inspiration, that "from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force" (Matt. xi. 12); and that Paul should say, "The mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way." (2 Thess. ii. 7.) That the "time would come when they would not endure sound doctrine; but . . . turn away their ears from the truth, and . . . be turned unto fables." (2 Tim. iv. 4.) That, after his departing, "shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock." (Acts xx. 29.) Again: "Let no man deceive you by

any means : for that day shall not come" [the day of the coming of the Son of man], "except there come a falling away first." (2 Thess. ii. 3.) (See 2 Tim. iii. 1, 5.)

Mysticism, cruelty, blindness, and spiritual darkness continued in accumulation until the whole world was enshrouded in it. "The Christians turned heathen again, and had only a dead form left." (JOHN WESLEY.) The most "abominable idolatry," depravity, and crime ensued until the *beast* held undisputed sway over all "kindreds, and tongues, and nations." (Rev. xiii. 7.) (See Dan. vii. 21 ; Isa. ii. 5, 6.)

Concerning the rise of this evil power, Paul wrote : —

"Let no man deceive you by any means [that the day of Christ is at hand]: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God." — 2 Thess. ii. 3, 4.

"For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way." — 2 Thess. ii. 7. (See whole chapter.)

Rev. Isaac J. Lansing, A. M., commenting upon the subject-matter here quoted, in very fitting words says : —

"I do not affirm that the sacred writer foretells the papacy in these prophetic words; but we risk nothing in claiming that the description actually outlines the pretensions and assumptions of the pope, and that Romanism allows to him nearly all, if not all, of the presumptuous claims that are here indicated. The lives of many of the popes certainly correspond to the definition — the man of sin — in their scandalous wickedness and

immorality. Their pride and pretensions are not unfittingly delineated in the words, 'who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped'; since, as I shall show, the pope opposes all other forms of religion except the Roman Catholic, and exalts his claims, so that his declarations demand of Roman Catholics as absolute respect and obedience as though they were the very words of God. He certainly 'sitteth in the temple of God'; and if he does not say, 'I am God,' he presumptuously asserts, in his claims to infallibility, the possession of attributes belonging to God alone." — *Romanism and the Republic*, page 61.

"The mystery of iniquity" began to work in Paul's day to corrupt, change, alienate, and effect the overthrow and utter ruin of that beautiful order and faith of which he was a chief advocate.

But what say others concerning the great apostasy that ensued after the death of the apostles?

Says the historian Marsh:—

"For a period of about six years after the ascension of Christ the apostles continued to preach the gospel to the Jews only, wherever they could find them throughout the Roman Empire. But, in general, they rejected it, and bitterly opposed and persecuted all who proclaimed it. The Lord, therefore, directed the apostles to turn their attention to the Gentiles." — MARSH'S *Ecclesiastical History*, page 152.

"Such was the moral state and character of the primitive churches. But they kept not their glory. The gold soon became dim. Some deceivers were among them who corrupted the mass. False teachers early introduced errors in doctrine. Believers grew cold and lukewarm, and through the power of indwelling corruption and the temptations of the world fell into very reprehensible sins. A vain and deceitful philosophy came near destroying the church at Corinth. . . . Among the seven promising and excellent churches of Asia there was scarce one that retained, at the end of forty years, her original purity of

doctrine or practice. And yet it was the golden age of the church." — *Ibid.*, page 159.

Again : —

"The history of the church of Christ, from the close of the first century to the commencement of the fourth, is one of continual enlargement, but of gradual and deep declension in doctrine and holy practice, and of awful suffering from the fires of persecution. It was not, as it had been under the ancient dispensation, *a distinct nation, governed by its own rulers and laws, appointed by God*, but it was composed of a vast multitude who lived in all parts of the Roman Empire who had been persuaded to renounce idolatry and enlist under the banner of our Lord Jesus Christ, and who were united in small associations or churches." — *Ibid.*, page 169.

"Almost proportionate with the extension of Christianity was the decrease in the church of vital piety. A philosophizing spirit among the higher, and a wild monkish superstition among the lower orders, fast took the place, in the *third* century, of the faith and humility of the first Christians. Many of the clergy became very corrupt and excessively ambitious. . . . Useless rites and ceremonies continued to increase. The minds of men were filled with the Oriental superstition." — *Ibid.*, page 185.

Again : —

"The revolution under Constantine (beginning of the fourth century) was one from which almost everything which the Christian values might be hoped. But, alas! such is the depravity of human nature, it was one in which almost everything of evangelical worth was lost. Constantine brought the world into the church, and the church was paralyzed. The number of nominal Christians were increased a thousand-fold. . . . Immense and splendid temples were erected and richly endowed, and a great priesthood was regularly organized and liberally supported. The body existed, *but the spirit had fled*. Constantine set up an immense national church, but the humility, faith, and the spirituality of the age of Polycarp had passed away." — *Id.*, page 198.



"The remainder of the fifth, and whole of the sixth century, the reader of ecclesiastical history finds but little that engages his attention. The church, washed, sanctified, and justified in the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of God, is *scarcely visible*." — *Ibid.*, page 208.

"Before the close of the sixth century the world was at ease, and superstition had made most rapid strides. The great mass of ministers were excessively ignorant, and, led away by the strongest fantasies, did little but delude and destroy the people. A thousand rites were performed, each one of which was supposed to have some wonderful power. A thousand relics were produced, whose touch, it was said, could heal the body and the mind. The most marvellous feats, called miracles, were performed. The most superstitious services were rendered to departed souls. The images of saints were worshipped under the belief that such worship drew down their propitious presence." — *Ibid.*, page 213.

"The Christian church was scarcely formed when, in different places, there started up certain pretended reformers, who, not satisfied with the simplicity of that religion which was taught by the apostles, meditated changes of doctrine and worship, and set up a new religion drawn from their own licentious imaginations." — *MOSHEIM'S Church History*, page 106, Chapter V.

"The Christian religion was, in its first rise, corrupted in several places by the mixture of an impious and chimerical philosophy with its pure and sublime doctrines." — *Id.*, page 112, Chapter V., paragraph 10.

"By the middle of the second century the councils and 'synods' had 'changed the whole face of the church,' and given it a new name." — *Ibid.*, page 145, Chapter II., paragraph 2.

Again : —

"There is no institution so pure and excellent which the corruption and folly of mankind will not, in time, alter for the worse, and load it with additions foreign to its nature and original design. Such, in a particular manner, was the fate of

Christianity in this (the second) century; many unnecessary rites and ceremonies were added to the Christian worship." — *Ibid.*, page 162.

Further, concerning the church immediately succeeding the apostles, Waddington says : —

"In the first place, it is certain that, from the moment in which the early churches attained a definite shape and consistency, and assumed a permanent form of discipline, — as soon as the death of the last of the apostles had deprived them of the more immediate guidance of the Holy Spirit, and left them, under God's especial care and providence, to the uninspired direction of mere men, — so soon had every church, respecting which we possess any distinct information, adopted the episcopal form of government." — WADDINGTON, Vol. II., page 20.

Mr. Jones, the learned historian, makes the following statements concerning the condition of the Christian faith in the days of Constantine : —

"Now, they began to new-model the Christian church, the government of which was, as far as possible, arranged conformably to the government of the state. The emperor himself assumed the title of bishop, and claimed the power of regulating its external affairs; and he and his successors convened councils, in which they presided, and determined all matters of discipline.

"The bishops corresponded to those magistrates whose jurisdiction was confined to single cities; the metropolitans, to the proconsuls or presidents of provinces; the primates, to the emperors, vicars, each of whom governed one of the imperial provinces. Canons and prebendaries of Catholic churches took their rise from the societies of the ecclesiastics, which Eusebius, bishop of Verciel, and after him Augustine, formed in their houses, and in which these prelates were styled their fathers and masters." — *Gospel Reflector*, page 10.

“The day of light — so illustrious in its beginning of [Christianity] — became cloudy. The papacy arose and darkened the heaven for a long period, obscuring the brightness of the risen glory of the Sun of Righteousness, so that men groped in darkness. By the reformation of the seventeenth century that dark cloud was broken in fragments; and though the heavens of gospel light are still obscured by many clouds, — the sects of various names, — the promise is that ‘at evening-time it shall be light.’ The primitive gospel, in its effulgence and power, is yet to shine out in its original splendor to regenerate the world.” — ALEX. CAMPBELL, *History of the Disciples*, by HAYDEN, page 36.

“Under the present administration of the kingdom of heaven a great apostasy has occurred, as foretold by the apostles. As the church, compared to a city, is called ‘Mount Zion,’ the apostate church is called ‘Mystery, Babylon,’ the antitype is to be destroyed by a Cyrus that knows not God. She is to fall by the sword of infidels, supported by the fierce judgments of God. The ‘Holy City’ is still trodden under foot, and the sanctuary is filled with corruptions. It is, indeed, a den of thieves; but strong is the Lord God that judges the apostate city. Till that great and notable day of the Lord come, we cannot from the prophetic word anticipate a universal return to the original gospel, nor a general restoration of all the institutions of the kingdom of heaven in their primitive character.” — ALEX. CAMPBELL, *Christian System*, page 178.

“The apostate church — Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots — changed even the Bible itself and the whole entire diction of the Christian institution, — the apostolic constitution or covenant.” — ALEX. CAMPBELL.

“But, allowing a few exceptions, we are authorized to say the whole world lieth in wickedness; yea, in the wicked one, as the words properly signify. Yea, the whole heathen world; yes, Christians, too (so called), for where is the difference save in a few externals? See with your eyes. Look into the large country of Hindostan; there are Christians and heathens, too. Which have more justice, mercy, and truth, the Christians or heathens? Which are more corrupt, infernal, and devilish in

1 their temper and practices, the English or the Indians? Which has desolated whole countries, and clogged the rivers with their dead bodies? O sacred name of Christian! O earth, earth, how dost thou groan under the curse of thy Christian inhabitants!" — *Sermon*, by JOHN WESLEY, from 2 Tim. ii., RICHARD WATSON'S *History of Wesley*, page 58.

2 "The gifts of the Holy Spirit were no longer to be found in the Christian church, because the Christians had turned heathens again, and had only a dead form left." — *Sermon* 94.

3 "How early and how powerfully did the 'mystery of iniquity' work in the church at Corinth. Not only schisms, heresies, animosities, fierce and bitter contentions, but actual open sins. We meet with abundant proof that in all the churches the tares grew up with the wheat, and that the 'mystery of iniquity' did ever work in a thousand forms. When James wrote his Epistle the tares had produced a plentiful harvest. There were envy, strife, confusion, and every evil work. Whoso reads with attention will be inclined to believe that the tares had well-nigh choked the wheat even at this early period; and that, among the most of them, no more than the form of godliness was left." — *Sermon* 96, by JOHN WESLEY.

4 "We have been apt to imagine that the primitive church was all excellence and perfection; and such, without doubt, it was on the 'day of Pentecost'; but how soon did the fine gold become dim; how soon was the wine mixed with the water; how little time before the Christians were scarcely to be distinguished from the heathens!

5 "And if so bad in the first century, we cannot suppose it to have been any better in the second. Undoubtedly it grew worse and worse." — *Ibid.*

6 "A Christian nation, a Christian city (according to the ancient pattern), was no longer to be found. Has the case altered since the Reformation? How little are any of these reformed Christians better than the heathen! Have they more (I will not say communion with God, although there is no Christianity without it), but have they more justice, mercy, and truth than the inhabitants of China and Hindostan?

"I doubt whether you ever knew a Christian in your life. I believe that you never did, and perhaps you never will; for you will not find them in the great and gay world, and none are Christians but they that walk as Christ walked; though they are called Christians, yet they are as far from it as hell is from heaven." — *Ibid.*

"By a comparison of the present state of Christianity with what it was once, all are brought to the conclusion that we are yet in the apostasy, — under the reign of the man of sin; yet in Babylon; yet in the wilderness." — BARTON W. STONE.

(See Chapter XII.)

Dear reader, did you ever pause and contemplate upon this wilderness of sin and depravity that has intervened between you and the beautiful woman "clothed with the sun and the moon under her feet," which is the emblem of the virgin church of Jesus Christ, and with which you need to be identified in order to be saved?

Take the history of the church founded by Jesus and the apostles, as described in the New Testament, on the other side of this mysticism and darkness, and note how beautiful in organization, how attractive in power, purity, gifts, and blessings. Her officers were apostles, prophets, sevens, high priests, elders, bishops, teachers, deacons, pastors, and evangelists. Her laws, faith, repentance, baptisms, the laying on of hands, the resurrection from the dead, and eternal judgment, together with a commanded godly walk of the highest type of morality and purity. Her blessings, the gift of the Holy Ghost, as manifested in prophecy, tongues, healings, interpretation of tongues, discerning of spirits, faith, knowledge, wisdom, the administration of angels, and communion with God. View this system of faith

and worship, with all of its imposing and captivating beauty of order, power, and consistency, and then take the history of the world and open at the beginning page on this side of the dark night of superstition and error, and see if you can discover an institution among all of the reformed sects of modern times that conforms perfectly to her pattern, as given in the New Testament, in organization, doctrine, and spirit. They may all make claim to be a continuation or renewal of the church, symbolized by the woman of Revelation xii. ; but claim is one thing, and fact another. Do their organizations harmonize with hers? Have they apostles and prophets as she had? Have they communion with heaven, the Holy Ghost in power, in visions, dreams, tongues, healings, and the administering of angels, as she had? Do they even claim so much?

After examining the whole of the Roman Catholic and even Protestant Christendom, you can but answer in the negative, "No, they are not in harmony with her pattern in organization and doctrine." Yet, your first duty, in connection with all others, is to "Seek ye first the kingdom of God," the church.

It has been said that such an organization is not needed in this age ; that the people are too wise, advanced, and pious ; that it was to be done away at the close of the ministry of the apostles, as having answered the end for which it was constituted, hence no longer needed. But when the proof for such a position is demanded, the answer is about as follows : "There is no such organization among the popular churches or sects, and if it was *necessary* there would be one ; that it is

evident that the ancient order of things was not to continue, because for so long a time it has ceased to exist."

But notwithstanding this popular dogmatism, we are specifically informed that apostles, prophets, teachers, etc., were to continue "till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." (Eph. iv. 13.)

It is evident that this Scripture provides for the existence, and the necessity for the continuation, of an inspired ministry to a later period in the world's history than this; for the Christians even have not come to the "unity of the faith," or "knowledge of the Son of God," to say nothing of other worshippers. The world is tossed to and fro, divided and carried about by every religious wind that blows, and stability and certainty are found nowhere. To-day a Methodist, to-morrow a Baptist, next day an Episcopalian, Congregationalist, Quaker, Unitarian, or some other unsatisfying faith; and then a Spiritualist, infidel, pantheist, or deist, a science healer, etc. This is not the unity of the faith spoken of by St. Paul. Coming to a unity is coming to the oneness of the faith. This is not the biblical oneness.

In evidence that there was to be a cessation of apostolic authority and divine inspiration, it is quoted: "Whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away." (1 Cor. xiii. 8.) But when shall this take place? Note, that prophecy,

tongues, and *knowledge* are all to pass at the same time. It won't do to tell people that they are not smart, and that they know but little nowadays. That time has not come, then, for "prophecy" and "knowledge" to cease, taking popular opinion as the criterion. The key is in verse nine: "We know in *part*, and we prophesy in *part*." But when Christ comes we shall see "face to face," know as we are known. Then, and not until then, will tongues, prophecy, and knowledge in "part" be done away, only for the want of faith, and obedience by the people. Again: "If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book." (Rev. xxii. 18.) But it does not say that God cannot "add" as it seemeth him good. "Man" is forbidden to "add," but God has not closed his own mouth; for it is written that he will give "precept upon precept; line upon line; . . . here a little, and there a little." (Is. xxviii. 10.) It is also written that "man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." (Matt. iv. 4.)

"If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and *it shall be given him*." — James i. 5.

There is no evidence in the Bible indicating that God will not speak to men, or that is opposed to the continuation of apostles and prophets in the church. Indeed, the Bible makes it quite imperative that they should be in the church, as well as making promise that the Lord will reveal himself to those who seek him.



The sects, then, notwithstanding their great influence, power, and popularity in the world, are not built according to the New Testament pattern, reluctant though we are to come to this conclusion. Facts beat all else. They have followed largely their own fancy, in church form, construction, and doctrine, in establishing themselves. Assumed the right to organize, change, and direct, without either the priesthood or a divine appointment, except what may appear strange and singular, interpreted as providences, for all hold that God cannot reveal himself in this age, and, of course, where there is no revelation, there can be no appointment; for, "how shall they preach, except they be sent?" (Rom. x. 15.) Where, then, is the Jerusalem church? She has not been transmitted down to us through the dark night of popish universal rule, as can be traced by either sacred or profane history. She was lost to the world in the dark day, — driven into the wilderness (Rev. xii. 14), where she was disrobed, changed, and transformed into the kingdom of the devil. (Rev. xvii. 3, 4, 5, 6.)

But some one exclaims: "It is true that there was a falling away took place; a great apostasy, and a reign of ignorance, superstition, idolatry, and intolerance ensued from the fifth to the fifteenth century; but when the Reformation began, and the revival of letters dawned, the dark curtain of the past was moved back, and superstition, barbarism, idolatry, and witchcraft gave way to science, freedom, tolerance, and the reinstating of the true religion; so that after the beginning of the sixteenth century, when Luther thundered against the pope, and threw off the yoke of the old mother, a

new light burst upon the world, and the freedom of conscience, toleration, and of speech was extended to all Christian societies. That men no longer groaned under a court of proscription and yoke of slavery, but all were left free to worship according to the dictation of conscience. That if men worship as their consciences direct (*i. e.*, about as they please), they must be acceptable. It matters not what church men belong to, if they are only sincere. The church cannot save them."

Why did God organize his church or kingdom, and call upon men to "seek first the kingdom of God," if it matters not what church people unite with? Or, if the church has nothing to do in saving them, why all the labor of authorizing and commissioning the ancient ministry to go into all the world and preach the kingdom of God, if, indeed, conformity to the doctrine, discipline, and government of the true church is but a matter of conscience? The kingdom of God was taken from the Jews and given to others because they refused to accept the true order.

Men's consciences approve that theory of faith which they have been schooled in as being correct, whether true or false. If they have been taught a false theory, their consciences nevertheless bind them to it. To belong to the kingdom of God and obey its laws, is to be saved. To go elsewhere is to be out of the ark of safety, whatever may be the state of the conscience. (See 1 Cor. i. 18; Acts ii. 47; Col. i. 13; 1 Thess. ii. 12; Luke xvi. 16.)

The following may be read with profit:—

“If the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch.” — Matt. xv. 14.

“But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost.” — 2 Cor. iv. 3.

“But the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him.” — Luke vii. 30.

“Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.” — John iii. 6.

The pernicious course persisted in by the blind Pharisees and Sadducees did not excuse them from not receiving the message of Jesus and John, because they were following conscientiously in another faith, either in part or as a whole. “If the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch.” Jesus denounced them as enemies of the truth, encompassing sea and land to make a proselyte; “and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves.” (Matt. xxiii. 15.) Vengeance overtook them. So will it all those who resist the truth upon the plea of a conscientious following in the wrong way.

Jesus said: —

“Enter ye in at the strait gate: for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat. Because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it.” — Matt. vii. 13, 14.

“Strive to enter in at the strait gate: for many, I say unto you, will seek to enter in, and shall not be able.” — Luke xiii. 24.

Will any presume to say that those who “seek to enter in” are not conscientious? Yet they are asked to “strive” to enter. Thousands bow daily to worship in blind obedience to their traditions and creeds, and at the

same time close their ears and doors against the truth, not willing to be informed, ready to scorn, misrepresent, scoff, and kill those who urge upon them the necessity of seeking and finding the truth. Away with such a conscience! Away with such a spirit! Away with such perversity and blindness! Away with such Christianity! It is antichrist!

Men to worship aright must not worship according to their own fancy as to what is right and proper, but according to "what is written in the law. How readest thou?" (Luke x. 26.)

"The true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him."—John iv. 23.

"Thy word is truth."—John xvii. 17.

"Thy commandments are truth."—Ps. cxix. 151.

"He that is of God heareth God's words."—John viii. 47.

"In vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."—Matt. xv. 9.

"If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house."—2 John 10.

"Many deceivers are entered into the world. . . . Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God."—2 John 7, 9.

It is said we do not need doctrine nowadays. It divides, etc. That one faith is as good as another, notwithstanding it is written:—

"Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed."—Gal. i. 8.

"To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."—Is. viii. 20.

According to these citations, and many more that might be adduced, there is something more to be considered in a true worship than the blind following of a misinformed conscience, or catering to the whims of blind guides and the precepts of men. Light has come into the world. "Awake, thou that sleepest!" "Let every man be swift to hear." (Jas. i. 19.) The effort now being made by the Protestant world to unify present existing forms of Christian belief among themselves and thereby present a solid front to the infidel world, is evidence that they realize the futility of their past effort at reaching the desired unity.

That such unity of faith and belief is necessary is shown from the words of the Saviour (John vii. 20, 21) : —

"Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me, through their word; that they all may be one . . . that the world may believe that thou hast sent me."

The skepticism of the present time is largely the result of the contradictions and incongruities of sectarianism. The doctrine of Christ is the means instituted by him to correct these errors and produce the desired oneness. The attempt, then, to dispense with the doctrine of Christ places them in the unenviable position of discarding the means presented by Christ, by which the desired unity among Christians may be obtained.

So Paul commanded : —

"Preach the word; . . . exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure *sound doctrine*." — 2 Tim. iv. 2, 3.

"Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee." — 1 Tim. iv. 16.

## CHAPTER VIII.

THE REFORMATION. — PROTESTANT CHURCHES, NAMELY, LUTHERAN, CALVINIST, PRESBYTERIAN, EPISCOPALIAN, BAPTIST. — THE LATTER'S CLAIMS TO TRANSMITTED AUTHORITY.

THE Reformation is not noted, nor its illustrious movers celebrated and admired, for reinstating the true religion, but the proclaiming against popish superstitions, indulgences, idolatry, and other doctrinal errors. Great credit is due those who toiled in so noble an enterprise, but the admiration inspired by the contemplation of an era of so great note, and the individuals who were indeed heroes in ecclesiastical warfare, should not lead one to such an unfortunate conclusion as to think that naught but *truth* received commendation and became engrafted upon the Reformation; but the fact should be remembered that the errors and superstitions of ages were retained, which in time became augmented by the introduction of new ones, until the Protestants became, in many respects, as superstitious, bigoted, and intolerant as the power they warred against.

Science brought with her a glory and renown worthy of her, the handmaid of progress; and all nations should unite in paying tribute to her worth, and proclaim undying fame to her heroes and martyrs. But conceding the many and rich gifts brought by the

Reformation and science, it is in vain that we look to either, or both combined, as having reinstated the true church, or a system of worship in exact harmony with that which was established by Jesus Christ and the apostles. Such an one is not to be found either among the Roman Catholic or Protestant sects. If such is extant, where is it? Where did it begin? By whom was it founded? Where is it now?

It was essential that Jesus and the apostles be empowered with the Melchisedec priesthood, and authorized by a divine revelation, in order to set up the kingdom of God at Jerusalem and preach the gospel to all the world; and it has been shown that there was a falling away, an apostasy, a transformation, yes, a breaking of the covenant (Is. xxiv. 5), and an entire overthrow of that church, and an age of darkness and blindness ensued fraught with the most direful and calamitous consequences. Superstition, idolatry, and imbecility reigned, and the Jerusalem church was obscured or lost in the darkness. Can a less power and authority, an inferior wisdom and direction than it took to *set up* the church, *reinstate it*?

It took apostles and prophets, empowered with the Melchisedec priesthood and a divine revelation, to establish the kingdom of God; then can an ambitious monk, detracting nothing from his great name and glory, whatever his learning and talents, or other mere reformers, *reinstate* it without either an apostle or prophet, the priesthood, or a revelation from God? If so, then Martin Luther and others, without the priesthood or a divine appointment, did, by their own wisdom,

all that a properly authorized ministry did anciently with such an appointment and authorization.

But what say others upon this most important subject? Dr. Wm. Smith says: —

“We must not expect to see the church of holy Scripture actually existing in its perfection on the earth. It is not to be found thus perfect either in the collected fragments of Christendom, or, still less, in any one of these fragments, though it is possible that one of these fragments more than another may *approach* the scriptural apostolic ideal.” — *Bible Dictionary*, page 163. -

“Who ever read anything about the Baptist Church at Corinth, or the Methodist Church at Rome, or the Presbyterian Church at Jerusalem? These names were unknown. These sects did not exist. They are *all* comparatively of *modern origin*. They are in *no* way, shape, or manner a **NECESSITY** to the **CHRISTIAN** religion, but a *positive hindrance to it*.” — N. RAVLIN, March, 1875, in Chicago. Report in *Advent Christian Times*.

“Dr. Thrall said there were many truths that can be developed only in two generations, because *one is not broad enough*. A Presbyterian clergyman said to him recently: ‘I believe the Confession of Faith of our church, of course, but I do not believe *it* as fully and as freely as I do the Bible.’ That was just the thing. The different sects are looking away from their creeds or catechisms to the absolute sufficiency of the Bible, and are learning that *church government, as described in the Bible, does not exist upon earth*.” — *New York Sun*, Oct. 11, 1874.

“Sectarianism, which is only another name for heresy, sprang out of the apostasy, and the parties named themselves according to their own fancy.” — JAMES MATHEWS.

“Surely there is something in Christianity higher and purer than any exhibition of it now known. The results, as they now



appear before our eyes, cannot be what its Author designed only to reach." — JAMES CHALLERS, *Elements of the Gospel*, page 67.

Also the following, under the head of the

**"ORIGIN OF THE FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH IN AMERICA."**

"In March, 1639, Mr. Williams became a Baptist, together with several of his companions in exile. As none in the colony had been baptized, a Mr. Holliman was selected to baptize Mr. Williams, who then baptized Mr. Williams and ten others." — *Struggles and Triumphs of Religious Liberty*, page 237.

"Mr. Williams remained pastor of the new church but a few months. He conceived a true ministry must derive its authority from direct apostolic succession or endowments; that therefore, without such a commission, he had no authority to assume the office of pastor, or be a teacher in the house of God, or proclaim to the impenitent the saving mercies of redemption. . . . He conceived that the church of Christ has so fallen into apostasy as to have lost both its right form and the due administration of the ordinances which could only be restored by some new apostolic or specially commissioned messenger from above. . . . In Mr. Williams's book, 'Hireling Ministry,' we find the following: 'In the poor, small span of my life I desired to have been a diligent and constant observer, and have been myself many ways engaged in city, in country, in court, in schools, in universities, in churches, in Old and New England, and yet cannot, in holy presence of God, bring in the results of a satisfying discovery that either the begetting ministry of the apostles or messengers to the nations, or the feeding or nourishing ministry of pastors and teachers, according to the first institution of the Lord Jesus, is yet restored and extant. . . . These imperfections in the church, in its revived condition, could be removed by a new apostolic ministry alone.' He therefore was opposed to the 'office of any ministry but such as the Lord Jesus appointed.' He conceived that the apostasy of anti-christ hath so far corrupted all that there can be no recovery out

*of that apostasy till Christ shall send forth new apostles to plant churches anew."* — *Struggles and Triumphs of Religious Liberty*, pages 238, 239. (See Knowles's History, page 172; Cotton's Answer, page 9.)

*To reform is to amend.* A reformation implies that whatever is being reformed has, at some time, fallen from a commendable plane of purity and worth, and is now striving by correcting and changing — proceeding from bad to better — to regain its former high standing and moral worth; or that it is emerging, for the first time, from among the elements of discord, dissensions, and vice by a gradual changing, correcting, and growth, with the view of obtaining a higher and a more desirable sphere of usefulness, perfection, and purity.

The Protestant world all pride themselves on not only being *reformers* but *reformed*. They concede that the papacy held the world in ignorance and bondage for long centuries, and that with a struggle they, either directly or indirectly, issued from her dark bosom of chaotic night, REFORMED. They unite in proclaiming her vile and unclean, and brand her as "MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH," yet she remains emphatically the MOTHER, nevertheless. They, having lopped off some of her most aggravating errors, lay claim to having reached forward to a higher ground, and attained to something of the primitive faith, spirit, and true order of things. Accepting all this, and the fact that bold, thoughtful, and noble men have sacrificed and toiled to secure this greatly to be desired condition, when viewed especially in contrast with the dark and misty past, yet

which one of all these sects has reinstated the church of Jesus Christ in its order, authority, power, inspiration, and completeness? Or have they so done, all combined? Have they nearly approximated to one like unto it?

In order to properly answer these interrogatives, it is necessary to briefly examine into the origin and something of the faith of some of the largest and most influential of modern churches, and compare them with the undeviating standard and test of the true church organization.

#### THE LUTHERANS

The history of the Lutheran Church is intimately connected with that of Martin Luther himself. It originated with him. History points him out as the most conspicuous, bold, and capable of the Reformers. But as a brief notice only is all that can be attempted in the short space allotted to this and the other denominations to which reference is herein made, and as it is intended to render the statements as authoritative as may be, to relieve them of all suspicion or distrust as to accuracy, or as having been written with prejudice or bias, the language of the best authorities is quoted largely, instead of presenting the subject-matter in the language of the writer. The following is in point: —

“The birth of the Lutheran denomination may, with some fitness, be dated from the year 1507, in which Luther, then a monk and twenty-four years of age, first discovered a Latin Bible among the rubbish of his convent library, from the perusal of which he derived his novel, and then almost unknown, ideas in reference to the doctrinal system of Protestant theol-

ogy. During ten years he continued to investigate and study the Scriptures, at the end of which period, in 1517, he made his first public foray into the territories of Rome by attacking the sale of indulgences, which at that time was carried on by Tetzel, in the vicinity of Luther's residence. . . . The pope decreed that his writings should be publicly burnt. In return for this compliment Luther collected together some of the standard works of the Romish Church, and burnt them, together with the condemnatory bull of the pope, in view of the inhabitants of the city of Wittenberg.

"The history of the Lutheran Church in Europe presents two very marked and prominent features. Her conflicts have been divided between those which she waged with the Church of Rome and those which were carried on within her own bosom by the disputes and everlasting differences of her own members. Debate and disturbances seem indeed to have been the natural and normal state of this sect during their whole past history. Even before the death of Luther, the opinions of Melancthon, his most intimate and trusted friend, became so widely dissimilar from his own, that a coldness of feeling ensued between them.

"In Europe the Lutheran Church is, at the present time, the most numerous of all the Protestant sects. Every possible shade of sentiment and belief can be found among them from the semi-Romish 'old Lutherans,' who, like Luther, adheres to the doctrine of consubstantiation, to the semi-infidel, who, like Strauss, Paulus, Rhor, and other modern rationalistic theologians of Germany, deny the inspiration and miracles of the Scriptures. In this country the same tendency to diversity of sentiment exists among the Lutherans.

"The German Reformed Church, as it exists both in Europe and in this country, is historically descended from the Swiss churches which were established in the sixteenth century through the instrumentality of the distinguished reformer, Ulric Zwingli. The original seat of this sect was in Switzerland. . . . Zwingli was the contemporary of Luther. . . . He was ordained as a Roman Catholic priest after having completed his studies at the University of Basle." — *History of All Denominations*, by SCHMUCKER, pages 21, 22, 23, 31.

The first move of Luther towards a reformation was mainly incited by the publishing of indulgences by Tetzel, a Dominican friar, while he was engaged in teaching theology and philosophy at Wittenberg.

The Reformation effected by him mainly consisted in opposing the supremacy of the pope, his infallibility, the sale of indulgences, mass, purgatory, celibacy, the worship of images, and auricular confession.

“Luther,” says Daniel Rupp, “received ordination from the hands of the Romish hierarchy, . . . and his ordination, therefore, and that of all his Protestant successors, is as valid as that of the Romish priesthood at the beginning of the sixteenth century; i. e., he was ordained by ministers properly accredited [by the Romish Church] at the time of its performance.” — *History of Religious Denominations in the United States*.

“The Lutherans, however,” says Dr. Buck, “of all Protestants, are said to differ least from the Romish Church, as they affirm that the body and blood of Christ are materially present in the sacrament of the Lord’s supper, though in an incomprehensible manner. . . . Towards the close of the seventeenth century, the Lutherans began to entertain a greater liberality of sentiment than they had before adopted, though in many places they persevered longer in severe and despotic principle than other Protestant churches.” — *Theological Dictionary*, page 246, by Rev. CHARLES BUCK.

The Reformed Lutheran Church is the state religion of Germany, and the king is the head of the church. This is a secondary offspring from the mother church.

#### THE CALVINISTS.

John Calvin, the great Geneva reformer, was contemporary with Luther, and was the founder of that system of faith and doctrine which still bears his name.

"Calvin was born at Nogen, in Picardy, in the year 1509."

Dr. Buck says : —

"Calvinists are those who embrace the doctrine and sentiments of Calvin, the celebrated reformer of the Christian church from Romish superstition and doctrinal errors." — *Theological Dictionary*, page 55.

The distinguishing differences of their faith from the Lutherans and Arminians consists mainly in what is

"denominated the *five points*; these are predestination, particular redemption, total depravity, effectual calling, and certain perseverance of the saints.

"They maintain that God hath chosen a certain number of the fallen race of Adam in Christ before the foundation of the world, unto eternal glory, according to his immutable purpose, and of his free grace and love, without the least foresight of faith, good works, or any conditions performed by the creature; and that the rest of mankind he was pleased to pass by, and ordain to dishonor and wrath, for their sins, to the praise of his vindictive justice." — *Ibid.*, page 55.

Calvin also was ordained by the Romish clergy, and hence his authority, like Luther's, was "as valid as that of the Romish priesthood," and no more so.

He was the chief advocate of that strange and unnatural belief that a part of the human race were elected to be eternally damned, and the remainder to be eternally saved, the conduct of either having nothing to do in fixing those conditions. He was so extreme as to teach that there are infants, even, confined to eternal burnings. His intolerant and vehement spirit was such that he became an extreme persecutor,

and put to death those who differed from him in religious opinion.

As this has been denied by some of Calvin's admirers, I will here quote the eminent writer, Philip Schaff, D. D., LL. D., himself a Presbyterian, in attestation of its truthfulness, as follows : —

“The Westminster Confession of 1647 is the clearest and strongest statement of the Calvinistic [sometimes wrongly called the ‘Augustinian’] system of doctrine. It is framed from the stand-point of Divine Sovereignty and Justice, and on the basis of a close alliance of Church and State. The assembly was itself the creature of the Long Parliament, appointed and paid by it, and amenable to its authority. The Confession, which was sent to Parliament under the title of the ‘Humble Advice,’ assigns to the civil government the right and duty of calling synods, protecting orthodoxy, and punishing heresy. It thus sanctions the *principle* of religious persecution, and the Long Parliament acted on this principle by the expulsion of about two thousand clergymen from their livings for non-conformity to Puritanism. The Church of England, after the Restoration, fully repaid this act of intolerance with interest by expelling and starving the Puritan ministers, including such men as Baxter and Bunyan, for non-conformity to episcopacy. Calvin and Beza had written special works in justification of the burning of Servetus. All the leading divines of the seventeenth century, Protestant as well as Roman Catholic, with the exception of a few persecuted Independents, Baptists, and Quakers, regarded religious toleration as a dangerous heresy and a device of the devil. This view was held even by the venerable and liberal Richard Baxter, and by the New England Puritans in the days of expelling Baptists, hanging Quakers, and burning witches. The principle of persecution, to the extent of burning heretics, is inseparable from the union of Church and State, which make a crime against the Church, also a crime against the State, to be punished according to law.”

In an accompanying note Dr. Schaff says : —

“As this statement has been denied [Calvin’s complicity in and justification of the burning of Servetus] by the *Mid-Continent* of St. Louis, Dec. 4, 1889, page 4, I shall give the title of Calvin’s book : ‘*Defensio orthodoxæ fidei de sacra trinitate contra prodigiosos errores Michaelis Serveti Hispani ubi ostenditur hæreticos Jure gladii coercendos esse.*’ ‘It appeared in 1554, a few months after Servetus’s death, and is republished in the new edition of Calvin’s *Opera* by the Strasburg Professors, Reuss, etc., Vol. VIII., 483, 644.’ The title of Beza’s tract is : ‘*De Hæreticis a civili magistratu cuniendis,*’ etc. Geneva, 1554, second edition, 1592, French translation by Nic. Colladon, 1560. Calvin wished the sword to be substituted for the stake in the case of Servetus; but as to the right and duty of the death penalty for obstinate heretics he had not the slightest misgiving, and it is only on this ground that his conduct in that tragedy can be in any way justified or at least explained. It is well known that all the surviving Reformers, even the gentle Melanchthon, fully approved of it.” — *Creed Revision in the Presbyterian Church*, pages 7 and 8.

Calvin’s authority and largely his spirit were conferred upon his immediate successors.

#### THE PRESBYTERIANS.

John Knox, the apostle of Presbyterianism, was born in East Lothian, 1505, and was educated at the University of St. Andrew’s. At about the age of twenty-five he “took orders” (was ordained) in the Catholic Church. His authority, too, was “as valid as the Romish hierarchy.”

“As a man of known ability, and as a priest, he was especially obnoxious to the hierarchy. His talents pointed him out as a fit person for the ministry, but he was very reluctant to devote himself to that important charge, and was only induced to



do so after a severe internal struggle, by a solemn call from the minister and the assembled congregation.

“After the accession of Queen Mary to the throne of England, at the request of his friends, Knox quitted England and went to Geneva, and there made the acquaintance of Calvin, whom he loved and venerated and followed more closely than any other of the fathers of the Reformation in his view both of doctrine and ecclesiastical discipline.” — *Sacred Biography and History*, by Rev. J. W. HARDING, D. D., pages 563, 564, and 565.

“The Presbyterian Church in Ireland was mainly the offspring of Presbyterian emigration from Scotland. . . . The Presbyterian Church in the United States derives its lineage from the Presbyterians both of Ireland and Scotland.” — *History of Religious Denominations in the United States*, by DANIEL RUPP, page 575.

The Presbyterians originally sprang up with and out from the Calvinists.

“They believe that the authority of their ministers to preach the gospel, to administer the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper, and feed the flock of Christ, is derived from the Holy Ghost by the imposition of the hands of the presbytery. . . . They affirm that there is no order in the church as established by Christ and his apostles superior to that of presbyters; that all ministers, being ambassadors of Christ, are equal by their commissions.” — BUCK's *Theological Dictionary*, page 364.

“The members of the Church of Scotland are strict Presbyterians; their mode of ecclesiastical government was brought thither from Geneva by John Knox, the famous Scotch reformer, and who has been styled ‘the apostle of Scotland.’ Their *doctrines* are Calvinistic, as may be seen in the Confession of Faith and the longer and shorter catechisms.” — *Ibid.*, 366.

“The first Presbyterians in America came from England, Scotland, and Ireland, about the year 1700. They settled in what is now a part of New Jersey and Delaware. The first Presbyterian

church formed in the United States was in Philadelphia, now known as the 'First Presbyterian Church' in that city."—*Ibid.*, page 367.

The following is a part of the Presbyterian "Confession of Faith," taken from Chapters III. and VI., as stated in "Creed Revision," and is received, together with all else in the creed, by members of the church, especially the clergy, "as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures":—

"III. By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death.

"IV. *These angels and men, thus predestinated and fore-ordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed; and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished.*"

"VI. As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath he, by the eternal and most free purpose of his will, foreordained all the means thereto. . . . *Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, and saved, but the elect only.*

"VII. *The rest of mankind God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of his own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth, for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sin, to the praise of his glorious justice.*"

In Chapter VI. the following occurs:—

"III. Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when, and where, and how he pleaseth. So also are all other elect persons who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the word.

"IV. Others, not elected, although they may be called by the ministry of the Word, and may have some common opera-

tions of the Spirit, yet they never truly come to Christ, and therefore cannot be saved; much less can men, not professing the Christian religion, be saved in any other way whatsoever, be they never so diligent to frame their lives according to the light of nature and the law of that religion they do profess; and to assert and maintain that they may, is very pernicious, and to be detested." — Pages 21, 22, 23, 24.

Again, Dr. Schaff says : —

"According to the Confession, then, Christ is not the Saviour of the world of mankind, but the Saviour of the elect only. This is in open contradiction to several of the clearest declarations of the Bible, such as 1 John ii.: Christ is the propitiation for our sins, *and not for ours only, but also for [the sins of] the whole world,*" etc. — Page 20.

Again : —

"But Augustine ran his system to an intolerable extreme. It leaves no room for freedom, except in the single case of Adam, who by one act of disobedience involved the whole human race in the slavery of sin. It suspends the history of the world upon that one act. It condemns the whole race to everlasting woe for a single transgression committed without our knowledge and consent six thousand years ago. Out of this mass of corruption, God by his sovereign pleasure elected a comparatively small portion of the human family to everlasting life, and leaves the overwhelming majority to everlasting ruin, without doing anything to save them. Calvinism intensified this system. . . . The Lutheran Church accepted the doctrine of the slavery of the human will in the strongest form, and also the unconditional decree of election." — *Ibid.*, page 41.

Dr. Schaff is a progressive Presbyterian. He believes in breaking away from the old absurdities fastened upon men in the past by the creed, and moving out into advanced light and a more consistent belief. He favors a revision of the creed, but will they revise

or condemn him, and others of like faith, as heretics, and put them out of the fold? Says he:—

“We need a theology and a confession that is more human than Calvinism, more divine than Arminianism, and more Christian and catholic than either.” — *Ibid.*, page 42.

“The Presbyterian Church in the United States originated in a union of immigrants from Ireland and England.” — *A Blending of Irish Presbyterianism and English Congregationalism*.

The first presbytery founded in this country was in Philadelphia in 1704.\*

It is not difficult to trace the authority or priesthood of this denomination to its source, — Rome.

#### THE EPISCOPALIAN CHURCH.

The Episcopalian, or Church of England, was founded by Henry VIII. of England, in the fore part of the sixteenth century.

In the early part of his life he belonged to the Roman Catholic Church, and wrote against Luther in defence of the claims of the pope, for which he received from his Holiness the title of the “Great Defender of the Faith.”

While a Catholic, he persecuted unto death those who would not subscribe to the papal faith. Growing weary of his wife Catherine, he became infatuated with the charms of Anne Boleyn, and appealed to the pope for a divorce that he might marry her. Out of policy, the pope declined his request, at which Henry became highly incensed, and, at the instigation of Bishop Cranmer, projected a scheme to place himself out of the

---

\* Religious Denominations, by Vincent L. Miller.

pope's power, that he might give free scope to his passions.

All Europe was involved in the dispute caused by his unrighteous demands, and, while the controversy raged, he put away his wife, and actually married Anne. Enraged at the course pursued by the pope, he seized the ecclesiastical reins of his own kingdom, reformed some abuses, and declared himself the *supreme head of the church on earth*.

The articles of faith received were : (1.) That the clergy ought to instruct the people according to the gospel. (2.) That baptism is essential, and that children should be baptized for original sin and obtaining the Holy Ghost. (3.) That penance is necessary to salvation, and confession to a priest where it may be had. (4.) In the eucharist the very blood and flesh of Christ were received. (5.) That they might pray to saints for intercession. (6.) Holy water, holy bread, and the carrying of candles, ashes, palms, and creeping to the cross, were retained ; and mass was said for the souls in purgatory.\*

This creed was changed from time to time, and was finally resolved into the Thirty-nine Articles. "John Wesley abridged and reduced these thirty-nine articles to twenty-five," which were made the basis of the Methodist faith.

Notwithstanding Henry had thrown off the Roman yoke, he retained her intolerant spirit of persecution, and had Dr. Barnes and Mary Askew, John Lambert,

Thomas Garrett, William Gerome, Bernard and Merton, Robert Lestwood, Anthony Pearsons, Adam Damlip, Thomas Benet, "with a great number of others, for presuming to differ from the king on the subject of the real body and blood of Christ, in the sacrament of the Lord's supper," \* publicly burnt at the stake at Smithfield for heresy. During his lifetime he beheaded two of his wives, divorced others, and, while dying, gave sentence to sacrifice the Duke of Norfolk.

A Catholic, writing of him, says : —

"At the time of the death of this merciless tyrant, which took place in the year 1547, when he expired in the fifty-sixth year of his age and in the thirty-eighth of his reign, the most unjust, hard-hearted, meanest, and most sanguinary tyrant that the world had ever beheld, whether Christian or heathen." — COBBETT'S *Six Letters*, page 18.

Of his chief priest, aider, and abetter at church making (Bishop Cranmer), he says : —

"Black as many others are, they bleach the moment that Cranmer appears in his true colors. But, alas! where is the pen or tongue to give us those colors? Of the sixty-five years that he lived, and of the thirty-five years of his manhood, twenty-nine years were spent in the commission of a series of acts which, for wickedness in their nature and for mischief in their consequences, are absolutely without anything approaching to a parallel in the annals of human infamy. Being a *Fellow* of a college at Cambridge, and having, of course, made an engagement (as the Fellows do to this day) not to marry while he was a *Fellow*, he married *secretly*, and still enjoyed his fellowship. While a married man he became a priest, and took the *oath of celibacy*, and, going to Germany, he married another wife, the daughter of a Protestant, so that he had now two wives at one time,

---

\* Fox's Book of Martyrs, page 279.

though his oath bound him to have no wife at all. He, as archbishop, enforced the law of celibacy, while he himself secretly kept his German *frow* in the palace at Canterbury, having, as we have seen in paragraph 104, imported her in a chest," etc. — *Ibid.*, page 42.\*

In the time of Edward VI. the church was established by an act of Parliament. The Episcopal Church in America was derived from the Church of England, and received her authority and model from that church.

Thus we have the origin, source, and authority of "*the Protestant Church of England as by law established*," from which that of America was descended.

#### THE BAPTIST CHURCH.

This sect had its origin in 1536, according to the most authentic account, and was founded by Menno Simon, a Romish priest of Friesland. They were first called Mennonites. This is as far back as there is any credible authority for extending the Baptist denomination, although the claim is made by some of them that there has existed an uninterrupted line of Baptist churches all the way back to the apostles, through which the priesthood has been transmitted unsullied in its authority and right, outside of the Roman Catholic Church. But this is purely an assumption, fanciful in the extreme, having no foundation in fact.

The Bible being opposed to such a claim, let us examine some of the evidences advanced in its support by those holding to that dogma: —

"Under the figure of the woman (Rev. xii.) the church existed for ages in obscurity, and an obscurity so deep as that its very existence was then by the great world unknown, and is

now with difficulty traced." — The Rev. T. G. JONES, D. D., in his *History of the Origin and Continuity of the Baptist Church*, page 451.

Query : Where was it?

Let Mr. Jones answer, on page 46 : —

"As a visible and located organization, where is the church founded at Jerusalem? For long ages it has ceased to exist, *in member digesta*."

Query again : Where is there one like it? Not among Catholic or Protestant denominations that can be found.

Again : —

"Since the kingdom of God was shut up in our bosoms, and was made known by no outward sign, they (the Baptists) existed by hundreds and thousands, as if not in existence."

Such is the kind of proof — dogmatical assertion — that is resorted to in order to support the theory that there has been a continuous line of authority extending from the time of the apostles unto the present, outside of the Roman Catholic Church, the line of the popes.

The Doctor confesses that they (the Baptists) — and he allows the existence of none others — were so obscure and in such dark recesses and out of the way places that none knew of their existence.

He closes by assuming that somehow the "kingdom of God was shut up" in their "bosoms," and that they existed in scores and hordes, and nobody knew of them. Miraculous ! Where were they ? If this be not a day of revelation, how did the Doctor find out so much ? Thus the Baptists endeavor to evade the ignominy of being an offshoot of the Roman mother by assuming, without



proof, that a pure and regenerate line has been kept up all the way from the apostles to the present time outside of the Catholic hierarchy, through which they succeeded to the priesthood, — the keys of power and right, — and they brand all the other sects as unclean and destitute of authority and right.

But the most tangible reason or assertion rendered by Dr. Jones to support the claim of the transmission of authority through Baptist churches from the apostles is, that of *necessity* there must have been a chain extending all the way down from the apostles from the fact that we see its two ends. But where are the two ends? or the one end?

It is true that were there a gold chain extending into the ocean at Liverpool, England, and at New York another was seen of the same material and make, also extending into the ocean, though the great body of it might be buried in the Atlantic, one might with safety conclude that these were but the two ends of the same chain. But if one of gold should appear in England, and in America one should be seen made of hay and straw, it would take one of the wildest freaks of the imagination to conclude that the latter was the other end of the gold chain! And, comparatively, the Baptist Church of to-day in its general contour, organization, doctrine, authority, etc., bears about the same resemblance to the ancient church at Jerusalem that a chain of hay and straw does to one of gold.

Dr. Dix, in speaking upon the authority question from an Episcopalian stand-point, which is different from the one assumed by the Baptists, says: —

"This is the constant deliverance of our branch of the church [Episcopalian], that from the apostles' time there have been three orders of ministers in Christ's church, — bishops, priests, and deacons. . . . That the apostolic office continues in the episcopate. . . . The phrase used to state this connection is that well-known one, — the apostolic succession. . . . We have not abandoned it. We assert it as fearless as ever, though sneering paragraphs and unwarranted statements go the rounds of the religious press.

"Next, let me say that the denial of the doctrine is in many instances the result of misapprehension and misunderstanding. That doctrine has been presented under the symbol of a long, thin chain, stretching from St. Peter and St. Paul down to our day. The strength of a chain is no greater than that of its weakest link, and if one link fail, all do break, the whole chain gives out at once. Now, there could not be a symbol less apt than this to convey the idea of succession as a practical fact. . . . The idea presented is not a chain, but that of a net-work coextensive with Christian organization, a net spread over the entire field of Christendom; meshes, not links, are here past numbering. . . . It means simply this: that a true ministry has always existed in Christ's church." — *New York Times*, Feb. 25, 1889.

Doctors here disagree. The Baptist chain-symbol won't do as an illustration for an Episcopalian. There might be a weak link discovered, or a place where there is none. Dr. Dix undertakes to shift the difficulty in order to stay up the Episcopalian assumption of having received divine power by transmission through the "episcopate," by spreading "a net-work of true ministers over the entire field of Christendom," and denying the Baptist chain argument or assumption. Living in the "meshes"! Nobody could find them! The Doctor concludes it a more difficult task to test a "net-work"

covering the world than a chain. But if there was "a net-work" there was "a thin chain." But neither can be shown. It is all assumption. "Mystery, Babylon" held sway over "all kindreds, and tongues, and nations." Her authority and religion and priesthood were everywhere,—in the "meshes" and out, as sacred and profane history attest. The "net-work" symbol and assumption is naught but a tremendous blind. The facts of history will not support it.

Dr. Dix, an Episcopalian, claims "a net-work"; Rev. Jones, a Baptist, claims a chain to have extended outside of the Roman Catholic Church; and the Roman Catholics claim that their authority descended in direct line through the Romish priesthood from Peter. Which?

A better informed class of Baptists have arisen of late years, however, who have the courage and integrity to renounce the absurd claim of transmitted authority through a continuous line of Baptist churches, and confess to the following.

Says Rev. Heman Lincoln, D. D., Professor of Church History in Newton Theological Seminary:—

"In glancing over the columns of the *Central Baptist*, I was attracted by your article. (By Prof. Norman Fox, of Williams College, Missouri.) Its sober views, sterling common-sense, and candid historical criticisms pleased me greatly. Your views accord with those of all scholars who have given the matter a thorough investigation. I have never known but one Baptist of large learning and sober judgment who held a different opinion—the late Dr. J. Newton Brown. He believed that a succession of true Baptist churches could be traced in a direct line from the apostolic age to our own time. Therefore the Publica-

on Baptist Succession

tion Society employed him to prepare such a history. Five years or more passed, I think, before the first volume of the work was ready for the press; but when the manuscript was submitted to wise judges, it failed to meet their approval, and was never published. Your position, I think, is the only safe one. We can attempt nothing more, with our present data, than to prove the existence of Baptist principles from the apostolic age to the present time. To trace a line of churches holding these principles, unmixed with radical errors, no wise and cautious student will undertake.

“Again, Dr. William Williams, who has so ably filled the chair of Church History in Greenville Theological Seminary, in a letter says:—

““There can be no doubt in the world that in our so-called histories of the Baptists, many sects are claimed as Baptists which, if now reduced, would not be acknowledged as such by any church or association, *e. g.*, the Novatians, Donatists, and Paulicans.

““From the fifth to the sixteenth century inclusive, there are no churches (unless we except the churches of the Mennonites with some errors) that can be called Baptist churches. As history now stands (what future researches will develop we cannot tell) it is impossible to trace any chain of Baptist churches from the days of the apostles till now.

““Those Baptists who are urging our claims on the ground of an historical succession, are only doing harm to us with all intelligent and well-read people. We do not need such aid for the success of our principles, however much Romanists and High Church Episcopalians may think they need it.

““Our country has few scholars equal to Dr. R. J. W. Buckland, Professor of Church History in Rochester Theological Seminary. In a private letter he says: “My historical investigations make it perfectly clear to me that a continuous line of Baptist churches from the time of the apostles to the Reformation period has never been established. Orchard’s attempt to do it is sadly weak, and would disgrace any historical writer.”

““He quotes the Fathers as holding views which they con-

demn, ignores many facts which would utterly disgrace his proposition, and shows throughout the folly of working from secondary sources of information. The valuable collection of Benedict is marred with the same faults and mistakes, and Mr. Ray's "Baptist Succession" falls into like errors. I am fully persuaded that, taking Baptist churches in the strictest modern sense, Baptist succession can never be historically established. Your position, as you state it, meets my hearty indorsement. There were bodies which held some of our principles, but they held them only in part. We do reach a distinctively Baptist church line in the Petrobrusians, in 1104, and I believe that we may claim that our distinctive principles were perpetuated continuously from that date onward into the Reformation period, and so to our day, although a part of the history is obscure, and the line may be a broken one. What we ought to rest upon is the historic continuity of Baptist principles, and their immutability.

"Dr. George W. Northrop, president of Chicago Baptist Theological Seminary, and one of our ablest professors of Church History, says: "The idea of an unbroken succession of regular Baptist churches, from the days of the apostles to our day, is a sheer historical picture. My opinion is, that it is altogether impossible to make out an 'unbroken succession' of witnesses for the truth outside of the Roman Catholic Church. I should prefer to attempt almost any other intellectual achievement conceivable."

"The Donatists are often spoken of as an essentially Baptist sect, but the statement seems to me to be wide of the truth. The Donatists had their bishops, presbyters, and deacons, nor did they differ from the Roman Catholic Church in regard to the proper mode and subjects of baptism. It would not strengthen our denominational position an iota to make out an unbroken succession of regular Baptist churches from the earliest times to the present. We depend on the "law and the testimony," not an unbroken succession, for the evidence that the church to which we belong is a scripturally constituted one.'

“Rev. David Weston, Professor of Church History in Hamilton Theological Seminary, quotes from a private letter of Dr. Cramp, author of ‘Baptist History,’ as follows:—

“‘Many of our brethren indulge in the pleasant thought that Baptist churches may be traced all the way back to the apostolic age. That they existed in that age I know very well, but from the establishment of infant baptism to the Reformation is a very dreary time. The chain may be there, but it only appears now and then, and the connecting links are wanting. Some of our historians are credulous,—some are careless.’

“Dr. Howard Osgood, Professor of Church History in Crozier Theological Seminary, and one of the most painstaking investigators that our country has produced, says regarding this discussion:—

“‘So far as I know, history does not tell with a clear voice of Baptist churches from A. D. 500–1000. I do not think the unbroken succession necessary to establish the validity of any Baptist church.’

“The above quotations are taken from the *Christian Record* of August, 1873, page 348, as taken by that paper from the *Bible Expositor*, and is the evidence of the historical faculty of the six principal Baptist Theological Seminaries of this country, touching the subject of ‘succession.’”—Found Vol. XXIV., page 18, of *Saints’ Herald* for Jan. 15, 1877.

But as there are Baptists, and possibly in considerable numbers, who are vain enough to assert that the Baptist Church descended in direct line from the apostles to the present time; and others, that their “principles and views” have descended; and still others, that their church descended directly from John the Baptist, it may be important here to briefly examine these claims.

The latter claim meets with defeat at the outset, for

it must be obvious to any Bible reader that John the Baptist founded no church, and of course none could by succession have come down from him. John himself says: "He that hath the bride is the bridegroom." (John iii. 29.) John was the friend of the bridegroom, and was to decrease. No church in primitive times was named after him. This did not occur until modern times; hence the very name "Baptist Church" shows that church to have been of recent origin, and defeats its claim for antiquity.

The Baptists, however, do not claim "apostolic succession"; for they say that the "apostolic office expired with John the beloved" ("Baptist Succession," page 15), because no longer needed. But who told the Baptists, or any others, that the "apostolic office expired with John the beloved"? Does the Bible say so? Did Jesus say that it would expire then? Did Peter, or Paul, or John, or any other inspired writer announce such a thing? No; no such affirmation is made by any of these witnesses for the truth. The Baptists, then, have assumed this position to start with, which is a flat contradiction of Paul's teaching, as follows: —

"And he [Christ] gave some apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry; for the edifying of the body of Christ: till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." — Eph. iv. 11-13.

The Bible thus continues apostles (and of course the apostolic office) and prophets in the church. The rea-

son for their continuance is given in the next verse, as follows : —

“That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive.” — Eph. iv. 14.

“Sleight of men, and cunning craftiness,” in that they would assume that the apostolic office ceased with John the Revelator, as no longer needed; and that their church, consisting of only pastors and deacons, is a continuation of that same old Jerusalem church which was established by Christ and the apostles. There are no witnesses anywhere, in heaven or on earth, who have given any evidence in support of this Baptist claim, whose statements are worth relating, and the Bible positively contradicts it.

The Baptists disclaim “popish succession,” calling it the “succession of antichrist”; and that “all well-informed Baptists are agreed,” says this writer, who appears to be one of note among them, “in the belief that we,” yes, we, “as a people, have continued from the times of Christ unto the present. In other words, they hold and teach the perpetuity of the church of Christ. They believe that Baptist succession exists” (“Baptist Succession,” page 15), and that the Baptist Church is that church. But which Baptist Church is the one standing in the true line of succession? This is not agreed upon by Baptists themselves, and there are many Baptist churches; yet this is the important thing to men interested in knowing the true way. This same writer, who seems to be wonderfully in love with the



Baptists, and down on everybody else (D. B. Ray), admits that there are Baptists who believe in succession, but "deny that the succession can be proved," yet he essays the task of proving it. Bold fellow, that!

Again, this writer has the courage to state that "No man can be in the church or kingdom of Jesus Christ who is not in that kingdom which has the succession from the apostolic age." Of course the Baptist Church, in the mind of the writer (the one he belongs to), is the one in the line of "succession," and all who do not belong to it are outside of the church or kingdom, — lost. It becomes very important, then, that we examine this claim in the light of New Testament facts.

Christ said, "I will build my church." Here it is announced that a church would be built. This church or kingdom has been defined in a preceding chapter; but for the benefit of Baptists it is here noticed again in connection with their claim to be a continuation of that church. Paul, in speaking of the specific construction of the church built by Christ, says: "Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular. And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues." (1 Cor. xii. 27, 28.)

Again it is written, when Christ "ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men," as follows: "And he gave some apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists," etc. These were to continue "till we all come in the unity of the faith."

God set these officers in his church; and this is the organization or kingdom that was built by Christ and the apostles, and the only one which they did build. Has that church descended down to us? And is the Baptist Church that church? Don't laugh, reader, at this Baptist presumption. You know, and they know, and every Bible student knows, that their church is not that ancient apostolic church; neither is it like it either in authority, organization, or doctrine. The Baptist Church sets itself above other modern churches in its high claim of being a continuation of the ancient church and kingdom of God; but it is no more like the ancient church than are other churches. Have they "first apostles" in their church? No; they say the "apostolic office expired with John the beloved," notwithstanding Paul affirmed that they were to "continue" in the church. Have the Baptists "prophets" in their church? No; with them prophets "expired with John" also. Then have they "miracles"? No; it seems that miracles also expired with John. Have they "gifts of healings"? No; they, too, ceased with John. Have they "diversities of tongues"? Oh, no; according to the Baptist claim, they "expired" with John too, as no longer needed. From a Baptist standpoint, one would be inclined to think that the whole apostolic church "expired," from a predetermined necessity, just about the time that John died. But the Baptists cannot prove, from any authentic source, that John died at all; neither can they prove that apostles were to cease from being continued in the church, at the time that they fix for the death of John. One is

inclined to feel just a little sad that it was ever announced that John died at all, if indeed all that was of chief worth to men pertaining to the gospel ceased with said announcement.

In the kingdom of God there were apostles, prophets, evangelists, healings, tongues, etc.; the Baptist Church deny the existence of any of these officers or gifts in their church, yet they have, some of them, the presumption to say, in the face of biblical protest, that their church is the continuation of the ancient apostolic church, when their church has in it, professedly, only pastors and deacons as officers. The assumption is too palpably absurd for serious consideration.

Further, the officers of the apostolic church were appointed by divine revelation, and were set apart by the imposition of hands by qualified ministers. "The Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away. So they, being sent forth by the Holy Ghost, departed unto Seleucia." (Acts xiii. 2, 3, 4.)

Again: "But as God hath distributed to every man, as the Lord hath called every one, so let him walk. And so ordain I in all churches." (1 Cor. vii. 17.) Paul ordained ministers as they were designated by the Holy Ghost; this method of appointment the Baptists repudiate, and claim that the congregation appoints and sends the minister. Notwithstanding, the Bible says they are "sent by the Holy Ghost." Is the Baptist Church, then, modelled after the ancient Jerusalem church?

In the church of Christ, "the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal."

"For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit; to another faith by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healings by the same Spirit; to another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another divers kinds of tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues."—1 Cor. xii. 8-10.

These were the choice and special gifts that belonged to Christ's church or kingdom; yet none of these are to be found in the Baptist Church. They don't believe in them. With them, they all "expired with John the beloved."

Paul says, again, "Follow after charity, and desire spiritual gifts, but rather that ye may prophesy." "Ye may all prophesy one by one." (1 Cor. xiv. 1 and 31.) Baptists have no spiritual gifts, and denounce prophecy, the very things that Paul exhorted the members of the church of Christ to "contend" for and "desire." Then, can their church be the continuation of the ancient church? Preposterous! It is no more like the ancient apostolic church than other modern evangelical churches. Of course it cannot help being just what it is, and this it has a right to be; but it is this haughty and unsupported assumption that demands consideration of the true inquirer. It is assumed further that *Baptist principles* have continued down from the apostolic church; and hence the Baptist Church has the precedence of all others. "Baptist principles *only* have continued down," is the statement of one writer, and this is believed by the larger number.

Let us examine this claim. The Baptists define the principles upon which the Baptist Church is built, or those which distinguish Baptists from all others, as follows : —

“1. The Baptists, as a church or kingdom, recognize Jesus Christ alone as their founder and head.

“2. The Baptists regard the Bible alone as their rule of faith and practice.

“3. The Baptists perpetuate the Bible order of the Commandments; they teach repentance, faith, baptism, and the Lord's supper.

“4. Baptists immerse, or bury with Christ in baptism, only those who profess to be dead to or freed from sin.

“5. Baptists recognize equal rights or privileges in the execution of the laws of the kingdom of Jesus Christ.

“6. Baptists observe the Lord's supper at his table in his kingdom.

“7. Baptists have never persecuted others, but have themselves always been peculiarly persecuted and everywhere spoken against.” — *Baptist Succession*, by D. B. RAY, pages 19, 20.

Now, it is questionable if a single one of these principles as a whole will stand the test of investigation according to the New Testament.

1. “The Baptists, as a church or kingdom, recognize Jesus Christ alone as their founder and head.” Jesus Christ never built a church “alone,” as claimed by this Baptist expounder of the faith. Jesus declared emphatically, “I do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things.” (John viii. 28.) Why do Baptists “recognize Jesus Christ *alone* as their founder,” when he says, “I do nothing of myself”? “He that sent me is with me: the Father hath not left me alone; for I do always those things

that please him." (Verse 29.) Again: "I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that his commandment is life everlasting: whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak." (John xii. 49, 50.) These texts, with many others that might be quoted, show that Jesus Christ did not build his church "alone," as claimed by the Baptists, but was aided and directed by the Father. Again, the Holy Ghost was an agent in the building of the apostolic church. Said Jesus: "But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you" (John xiv. 26), with many other texts of similar import. The Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost, not to mention angels and men, aided in founding the apostolic church at Jerusalem, and this defeats the Baptist claim that Jesus Christ alone founded that church, or what is tantamount to it, their church.

2. "The Baptists regard the Bible alone as their rule of faith and practice." The Bible nowhere affirms that it "alone" is the rule of faith and practice for Christians. Jesus and the apostles declared no such thing. But on the contrary, Jesus said, "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." (Matt. iv. 4.) "The Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things." (John xiv. 26.) "He will guide you into all truth." (John xvi. 13.) "How shall they

preach, except they be sent?" (Rom. x. 15.) The ministry in Christ's church were designated by the Holy Ghost, hence it was essential that it continue in the church. Does the Bible designate by name any living Baptist for the ministry? If not, and it is essential for them to preach, the Bible "alone" is not a sufficient guide. The Holy Spirit was to be a guide in the church as well as the written word. Jesus, the inspired head of the church, while ministering among the people, recognized the written word as an essential guide, but not it "alone," as do the Baptists. Peter said, "We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed." (2 Peter i. 19.) But he did not exhort to take it alone. Jesus said, "Search the Scriptures," but he nowhere says, rely on them alone. So the second Baptist principle is shown to be contrary to the teaching of the Bible, hence erroneous and false.

3. "The Baptists perpetuate the Bible order of the commandments; they teach repentance, faith, baptism, and the Lord's supper." This principle is also at variance with the word of God. The Bible does not teach that "repentance" precedes faith in the order of Christian doctrine and experience. The announcement of John the Baptist was, "Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." (Matt. iii. 2.) Jesus says, "Repent ye, and believe the gospel." (Mark i. 15.) But these declarations were made to the Jews, who accepted a faith in God, the law, and the prophets, but were sinners and transgressors of the law which they themselves acknowledged; hence they were required to

“repent,” cease from dishonoring the law, and make ready, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand. Repent and believe the gospel, which includes faith in God and in Jesus Christ, and the acceptance of the doctrine of repentance and baptism. The clearest and most orderly presentation of these principles that is recorded in the Bible was made by the Apostle Peter on the day of Pentecost. Paul says, “Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.” (Rom. x. 17.) Again, “He that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.” (Heb. xi. 6.) The first step toward a Christian conversion was to hear. The second was to believe. The third, to repent. Fourth, to receive baptism. Fifth, the laying on of hands for the receiving of the Spirit. This is the order set out in the New Testament. Common-sense even tells a man that he cannot repent until he believes; for repentance is to cease following in a given way, and walk in some other, believed to be more consistent and true. The true gospel order as presented on the day of Pentecost is clear and explicit. Peter stood and addressed a large gathering of Jews, who, at the beginning of his discourse, had no faith in Christ or his work. After hearing Peter, and seeing the marvellous exhibition of power manifest on that occasion, they changed their minds about Christ and his mission. “They were pricked in their heart.” Indeed, believed just what Peter had declared to them, “That God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ.” It was then that they “said unto Peter and the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren,



what shall we do?" They saw the folly of their past acts, and now have faith in Jesus Christ. What next? "Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." (Acts ii. 37, 38.) The receiving of the Holy Ghost was doubtless to be obtained upon the condition that they would comply with the requirements of the law through which the Spirit was given. An example was given down at Samaria, as follows: "Now when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John: who, when they were come down, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost: (for as yet he was fallen upon none of them: only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.) Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost." (Acts viii. 14-17.) This is a plain, definite statement of a work performed by two of those to whom Jesus said, "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." (Matt. xxviii. 20.)

Paul also followed the same order, as may be seen by the following:—

"When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues, and prophesied." — Acts xix. 5, 6.

Faith in God and in Jesus Christ, repentance, baptism, and the laying on of hands, was the gospel order as practised by the ancient saints. The texts relied

on by the Baptists to prove that repentance precedes baptism do not sustain their theory. The statements, "Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," "Repent ye, and believe the gospel," were addressed to a class of men who had transgressed Moses and the prophets, and were under condemnation. They were required to repent of their iniquity, with the further demand that they accept Christ, with his doctrine of faith, repentance, and baptism, as taught in the gospel. It was not in the speaker's mind, as the contexts show, to give the order of the principles of the gospel as believed and practised, but to call them to repent of their transgression of the Jewish law, and to the acceptance of the gospel plan as a whole. Other circumstances would doubtless demand or call out different phraseology to meet them, as in the case of Acts iii. 19, where it is related that Peter said, in addressing the people, "Repent, and be converted."

Again, the Lord's supper does not follow next in order after baptism, as claimed by Baptists, but the laying on of hands, as has been shown. The washing of feet even preceded the Lord's supper in the order of time; hence the Baptists are wrong, also, in their third principle that is assumed to have come down by "succession."

Feet washing and the laying on of hands, with them, it is likely, "expired with John the beloved."

4. "Baptists immerse, or bury with Christ in baptism, only those who profess to be dead to or freed from sin."

Now this principle, as held by the Baptists, is both

absurd and in conflict with the Bible. John the Baptist preached the "baptism of repentance for the remission of sins"; which is to say, that remission of sins was obtained through obedience to the message presented by John, that is, faith, repentance, and baptism. This was doubtless the reason that John said to Jesus, "I have need to be baptized of thee." John could conceive that he might have sins to remit, but he could not conceive how Jesus could. Peter put it, "Be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." (Acts ii. 38.) Ananias said to Saul, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." (Acts xxii. 16.) Baptists deny this order which was established in Christ's church, and baptize those who are already "freed from sin," "for an outward sign of an inward grace," something no Bible writer ever heard of. So this cherished fourth principle, when weighed in the balance, is found wanting, also in conflict with truth.

5. "Baptists recognize equal rights or privileges in the execution of the laws of the kingdom of Jesus Christ." Do Baptists mean by this that ministers in their church all hold equal authority? If so, this, too, is opposed to Christ's order. For there was a distinction in authority held by his ministry. They were apostles, seventies, elders, bishops, teachers, deacons, etc., some being greater than others in point of official standing. The Baptist claim is faulty here also. The distinction is apparent in the New Testament.

6. "Baptists observe the Lord's supper at his table in his kingdom." Which of all leading evangelical

churches is it that does not do the same? How came this custom to be peculiarly Baptist? Do they eat different from others; and if so, are they right?

7. "Baptists have never persecuted others, but have themselves always been peculiarly persecuted and everywhere spoken against." This, it appears, is also contrary to the facts as known.

Dr. Buck says the Anabaptists of Germany "depended much upon certain ideas which they entertained concerning a perfect church establishment, pure in its members, and free from the institutions of human policy." Some of them thought it possible "to purify the church"; others, not satisfied with Luther's plan of reformation, undertook a more perfect plan, or more properly, a visionary enterprise, to found a new church." They made rapid progress. Some believed in the doctrine of polygamy, visions, and revelation. When they failed to carry out their plans by persuasion, "they then madly attempted to propagate their sentiments by force of arms. Munger and his associates, in the year 1525, put themselves at the head of a numerous army, and declared war against all laws, governments, and magistrates of every kind." (Buck, "Ecclesiastical Dictionary," pages 15, 16.) In 1537, Menno Simon put himself at the head of a body of Anabaptists, supposed to be "exempt from the fanatical frenzy of their brethren at Munster (though according to other accounts they were originally of the same stamp, only rendered somewhat wiser by their sufferings)."

The plan of doctrine drawn up by Menno Simon was of a much more "mild and moderate" nature than that

of the "furious and fanatical Anabaptists." "Nothing can be more certain than the fact, viz., that the first Mennonite congregations were composed of the different sorts of Anabaptists, — of those who had been always inoffensive and upright, and of those who, before their conversion by the ministry of Menno, had been seditious fanatics." (*Ibid.*, pp. 269, 270.)

Thus it is shown that Baptists have not been so pure and holy as they would like to appear. In the minds of most Baptists, and especially the writer of "Baptist Succession," all nearly of the noble men and women who have stood independently for truth since the apostles, were Baptists. But there is no more authority for calling them Baptists than by the name of other sects. Since the time of the apostles there have been men who believed, doubtless, that immersion is the proper mode of baptism, but this alone did not make them Baptists, in the sense that Baptists are known as a denomination.

Again, Baptists say that they "have themselves always been peculiarly persecuted and everywhere spoken against." Wherever they have lived they have been the victims of the malice and hate of others in Europe and America, "everywhere spoken against." Now who is it that is "peculiarly" persecuting the Baptists in America to-day, or speaking against them? If this persecution consists in others not indorsing all of the Baptist teaching and affiliating with them, is it not equally true that they persecute others because they do not conform to their views? In point of toleration and liberality of sentiment the Baptists are not equal to many other denominations. The Baptist pulpit is not

a free one. They do not carry out, more than others, that sentiment expressed by the Saviour, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." The writer by experience chanced to know something of the sweetness ( ? ) of this exalted church. Once, when in Hudson, Wisconsin, he desired the use of the Baptist church in which to present the teaching of the New Testament, but the Baptist minister informed him that the church was dedicated "for us, and us alone, and we don't want others to use it." Again, the writer was turned out of the Baptist church at Charles City, Iowa, after they having agreed to allow him the use of it for five consecutive evenings; yet no objection was offered against what he preached as not being New Testament doctrine; and he has had many similar experiences with them since. Baptists call such treatment as this, when extended to themselves, persecution. What is it, then, when they extend the same to others? The Baptists, then, persecute others right here in the United States, in a mild form, the only way they dare do it, by putting them out of their houses of worship, and ostracizing them and hedging up their way. Do others do more to them? So away goes the seven cherished principles adhered to by the Baptists, with the possible exception of the sixth, as having come down to them by "succession" from the apostles. All of truth expressed in them does not belong more to Baptists than others, and in the Christian churches in general.

But in thus examining the question of succession by certain principles accepted by the Baptists, which are found to be wanting when compared with those of

Christ's church, the breach is not more apparent than should we take some of the important principles that distinguished Christ's church from all others, and compare them with what is actually taught and believed by the Baptists. If there was any one peculiarity that was chief in distinguishing the early church from all others, it was that of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. With the ministry of John it began to be taught, "I indeed have baptized you with water: but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." (Mark i. 8.) Jesus taught it, and commanded them not to depart from Jerusalem until the realization of this, "which, saith he, ye have heard of me." (Acts i. 4.) This peculiarity of Christ's doctrine might well be likened unto "new wine being put into old bottles" when he instructed the Pharisees touching his principles. Those were to be baptized with the Holy Spirit who accepted the doctrine taught by John and Jesus, and none others, because new vessels, and none others, could contain it. "New wine must be put into new bottles; and both are preserved. No man also having drunk old wine straightway desireth new; for he saith, The old is better." (Luke v. 38, 39.)

Peter, on the day of Pentecost, speaking of this baptism and power, says, "For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." (Acts ii. 39.)

Paul, speaking of this feature of the faith, says, "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." (1 Cor. xii. 13.) But this chief feature of the early Christian faith is not believed by the Baptists at all.

No one among them claims, or has ever had, the baptism of the Holy Spirit, nor do they teach the doctrine to their adherents, as did John and Jesus. They even go so far as to teach that "The real baptism of the Holy Spirit always endowed the possessor with the gift of tongues, or inspiration" ("Baptist Succession," by Ray, p. 12), and these spiritual gifts, they stoutly argue, "expired with John the beloved." The Baptist Church, then, does not believe in or teach the principles necessary to be believed in and taught, in order to make a legitimate succession of the early or apostolic church.

Rev. A. D. Gillett, A. M., pastor of the Eleventh Baptist Church of Philadelphia, in making a plea for Baptist succession, says : —

"We want it distinctly to appear that we hold the existence of our principles and not our name. We do not say that a separate church has been known as a Baptist Church from the apostles, but views and practices . . . held by Christians." — *History of Religious Denominations in the United States*, by D. RUPP, page 46.

Just think ! here it is presumed that somebody had "views" and "practices" of Christian character ; and then it is presumed further that they were Baptist "views" and Baptist "practices." With equal propriety he might have assumed that they were Methodist "views" and Congregationalist "practices," for each and all of modern churches hold some Christian views and practices, even heathens.



*“Socinians united with the Anabaptists, and both of them deriving their Origin from Luther and Calvin.*

“We have seen the illusions of the Anabaptists, and are sensible it was by following the principles of Luther and the rest of the reformers that they rejected baptism without immersion, and infant baptism; for this reason, that they did not find them in the Scripture, where they were made to believe all was contained. The Unitarians or Socinians united with them, yet not so as to keep within the limits of their maxims, because the principles they had borrowed from the reformers led them further. M. Jurien remarks that they came forth a long while since the Reformation, from the midst of the Church of Rome. Where is the wonder? Luther and Calvin came forth from her as well as they. . . . It was in the bosom of these churches, at Geneva, amongst the Swiss and the Polish Protestants, that the Unitarians sought a sanctuary. Repulsed by some of these churches, they raised themselves a sufficient number of disciples amongst the rest of them to make a separate body. This, beyond question, was their origin. . . . This sect (the Unitarians) was nothing but a progress of, and a sequel from, the dogmas of Luther, of Calvin, of Zwinglius, of Mennon, the last of whom was one of the heads of the Anabaptists. There you will find all those sects were but ‘the first draught, and, as it were, the dawn of the Reformation, and that Anabaptism joined to Socinianism is the mid-day.’” — *History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches*, by JAMES BENIGN BOSSUET, Vol. II., pages 310, 311.

“Therefore, when Muncer, with his Anabaptists, assumed the title and functions of a pastor, Luther would not suffer the question to turn on what he might call essential, or admit he should prove his doctrine from the Scriptures, but ordered he should be asked, Who had given him commission to teach? Should he answer, ‘God,’ let him prove it.

“The Anabaptists, another shoot of the doctrine of Luther, who were formed by pushing his maxims to their greatest extent, mixed in the tumult of the boors, and began to turn their sacrilegious inspirations to manifest rebellion.

“The revolted peasants had met together to the number of forty thousand. The Anabaptists rose in arms with unheard-of fury.” — *Ibid.*, Vol. I., pages 37, 51, 52.

“The truth is, that the Anabaptists of the Reformation were of diversified character. Some of them, if we are to credit the charges made against them, rested their pretensions to superiority as Christian churches exclusively on the mode of administering baptism. Others were called by the same name, who insisted that there was no necessity for church organization, and denied the doctrine of the resurrection. But there is the clearest and most ample evidence to show that, in contradistinction to these parties, there were sincere and exemplary people who formed their articles of faith in the simple words of the New Testament, and evinced the most peaceful spirit. Some of the Anabaptists held the theory of a community of good.” — *Congregational History*, pages 706, 710, by JOHN WADDINGTON.

“The Baptists in former times frequently called themselves Antipedobaptists (opponents of infant baptism); while by others they were known as Anabaptists (Rebaptizers). The Baptists have always repudiated the latter designation. They never repeat the initial Christian rite upon one who has received scriptural baptism. . . . Baptists assert that their doctrines were held with more or less fulness by various sects of so-called heretics of the middle centuries, notably among them the Cathari, Paulinicans, Josephites, Arnoldites, Lollards, Mennonites, and many others flourishing in every quarter of the Christian world, and continuing in some instances down to the days of the reformers. . . . Hansard Knollys was the pastor of a church in Dover, N. H., which he founded in 1638. This was a Congregational organization. Very soon after the formation of this church he became a Baptist, and proclaimed his sentiments to his people. About the same time, 1639, the illustrious Roger Williams founded the First Baptist Church of Providence, R. I.; this was the first Baptist community in America, and is in existence still. . . . The regular Baptists in all countries recognize but two classes of officers in their churches, pastors and deacons; the former serve only in the ministry of the word, and they

possess equal authority. Baptist churches are congregational in their government; every member has a right to vote in church meetings upon all questions, and the decision of the majority is final. *Regular Baptists are Calvinists.* They use the word 'particular' to express their belief in a limited atonement." — *The New People's Cyclopedia of Universal Knowledge*, Vol. I., page 208.

The following is in evidence that no transmission of authority has come down to the present, either through Baptist or papist claims: —

"We are not to suppose, however, that there is any uniformity among writers, or certainty as to the three or four supposed successors of St. Peter. Says Mr. Walsh, the author of a compendious but learned history of the popes, originally published in German: —

" 'If we may judge of the Church of Rome by the constitution of other apostolic churches, she could have had no particular bishop before the end of the first century. The ancient lists,' he adds, 'are so contradictory that it would be impossible exactly to determine, either the succession of the bishops, or their chronology. Some say that Clemens, of Rome, had been ordained by the Apostle Peter, and was his immediate successor. Others place Linus and Cletus betwixt them. A third set name Linus, but, instead of Cletus, name Anacletus, Anencletus, Dacletius. Lastly, a fourth party states the succession thus: Peter, Linus, Cletus, Clemens, Anacletus.' " — *WALSH'S Lives of the Popes.*

Dr. Comber, a very learned divine of the Church of England, says: —

"Upon the whole matter there is no certainty who was the bishop of Rome, next to the apostles, and therefore the Romanists build upon an ill bottom when they lay so great weight

on their personal succession." — DR. COMBER on *Roman Forgeries in Councils*, Part I., Chapter I.

"Amidst all these varying and opposing lists, this contradiction and confusion worse confounded, how utterly baseless must be those pretensions, whether made by the papists of Rome or the semi-papists of Oxford, which are founded upon a supposed ascertained and unbroken descent from the apostles! The arguments to sustain them are lighter than air. Hence we are not surprised to hear that bright luminary of the British establishment, Archbishop Whately, declare his solemn conviction that '*There is not a minister in all Christendom who is able to trace up, with any approach to certainty, his own spiritual pedigree. . . . That any one who sincerely believes that his claim to the benefits of the gospel covenant depends on his own minister's claim to the supposed sacramental virtue of true ordination, and this again on apostolical succession, must be involved, in proportion as he reads, and inquires, and reflects, and reasons on the subject, in the most distressing doubt and perplexity.*'" — WHATELY on the *Kingdom of Christ*, Essay, *History of Romanism*, pages 48 and 49.

"The following facts are undeniable, namely, 'that the Roman Catholic religion was the religion of all Christian countries and governments until about the year 1520, when Henry the Eighth was king of England.'" — COBBETT'S *Six Letters*, page 2.

Admit, as is held by all Protestants, that the "little horn" of Daniel (Dan. vii. 8, 23) represents the papacy, and the above appears quite correct. This evil power was to make "war with the saints, and prevailed against them." "And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them : and power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations." (Rev. xiii. 7.) So there is no place for a connected line of anything outside of the Catholic Church.

The first Baptist church in America was formed by Roger Williams, at Providence, R. I., a dissenter from the Church of England. He had been baptized and ordained by ministers of that church. But "he renounced his baptism, was rebaptized by Mr. Ezekiel Holyman, then proceeded to baptize him and ten others, and thus formed the first Baptist church in New England." \*

The authority for this establishment, if there was any at all, was from Rome through the Church of England. Menno Simon, the chief originator of the Baptist Church, was a Romish priest; and Roger Williams, the founder of the sect in America, was a Church of England clergyman. Hence it is not difficult to determine the authority upon which the Baptist Church rests both in the Old and the New World, its inception being from Rome, and the offspring from Episcopal England.

All of the above-named sects sprang out of the papacy, with papal authority to establish them, if any at all, and they have ever laid claim to a sufficiently near contact or relationship to the old mother, as to have received of her transmitted authority, with the single exception, the Baptists, and they make such a pitiable showing in their attempt at maintaining their claim, that even their own best informed men scoff and ridicule it.

The mother — Roman Catholic — held the keys of authority, or so claimed. Her children rebelled, took a little of her leaven of authority, and set up for themselves. The mother would hurl bulls and anathemas

at her rebellious children, and they in turn would brand her with the vilest of epithets, and continue to build themselves up according as each leader's fancy prompted him.

The reformers all, with one voice, declare that the Roman Catholic is the church symbolized by the woman of Rev. xvii., and named the "Mother of Harlots." Conceding this as true, after reading the history of the rise, progress, and claims of the Reformation, it is not difficult to divine as to who is meant in the text as the daughters; sad and disconsolate as it may appear, we cannot evade the logic of facts. To deny is foolish.

The mother was intolerant, superstitious, and oppressive. The daughters inherited mildly of her inclinations and instinct. Each, in turn, as she gained power and popularity over that of others, has dogged and persecuted those not in affiliation with her. If not done by the authority of the organization, it winked at the actions of their communicants.

Even in the land of America, "the home of the free," where science and religion are fostered, and toleration and the rights of men are the boast of the land, the old persecuting spirit has had a lurking and resting place; and men's consciences have been proscribed, and they persecuted unto death, the strong arm of the law but standing in the way of re-enacting, in many instances, the old vicious and horrid cruelties of the days of the Inquisition.

Thus, notwithstanding the great pretensions to divine power and right laid claim to both by the Romanists and some of the Protestants, they fail to show the

connecting links of the chain they argue has extended all the way down from Peter to the present time, and through which the priesthood, with its power and gifts, has been transmitted.

Although volumes have been written by the most learned and astute of the respective parties holding to transmitted authority, they fail, unmistakably fail, to show the transmission; and their learned and labored efforts only go the more to prove the weakness of their claims and positiveness of their assumptions.

But admitting the Roman Catholic claim for transmitted authority, the Protestant's claim remains still unsupported; for if the Romish Church held the "keys," and could confer authority, she could also excommunicate; and this is just what she has done with all Protestant sects, whether receiving of her supposed transmitted authority, or otherwise, from Alpha to Omega, as the following shows:—

"We excommunicate and anathematize, in the name of God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and by the authority of the blessed apostles, Peter and Paul, and by our own, all Wickliffites, Hussites, Lutherans, Calvinists, Huguenots, Anabaptists, and all other heretics [and all are heretics who do not believe like Roman Catholics] by whatsoever name they are called, and of whatsoever sect they be; and also, all schismatics, and those who withdraw themselves, or recede obstinately from the obedience of the Bishop of Rome; as also their adherents, receivers, favorers, and generally, any defenders of them, *together with all who, without the authority of the apostolic see, shall knowingly read, keep, or print any of their books which treat on religion, or for any cause whatever, publicly or privately, on any pretence or color, defend them.*" — *Bull of Gregory XII., 1411; Pius V., Urbane VIII., in 1627; and Pius IX., October, 1859; Romanism and the Republic, page 222.*

Thus it is in vain that we look to Martin Luther, John Calvin, Menno Simon, John Knox, or Henry the Eighth — accepting that each and all made rapid strides in the direction of reform and progress, did a most commendable work — as the men who moved back the dark curtain of Romish usurpations, superstitions, and errors, and reinstated the primitive church of Jesus Christ in its true order and authority, in doctrine, organization, discipline, theory, and fact.

But the history of the Reformation itself shows that neither of the above-named sects constitutes the true church of God. In proof of this we have but to show that it was thought needful and wise that a *second* step be taken at *reform*.



# METHODISTS

## CHAPTER IX.

**JOHN WESLEY AND THE METHODIST CHURCH. — FRIENDS OR QUAKERS. — CONGREGATIONALISTS. — DISCIPLES OR CAMPBELLITES. — THE POLICIES OF BOTH ROMAN CATHOLICS AND PROTESTANTS PACIFIC WHEN LAW FORBIDS PROSCRIPTION. — THE SPIRIT OF OLD PERSECUTIONS ASSUMES A MILD FORM.**

IN 1729 a reformation began under the auspices of Mr. John Wesley, within the already reformed Church of England; and if the Episcopal Church of England was the church of Jesus Christ, and accepted with him, then Mr. Wesley must have been a heretic, an introducer of heresy, opposed to the right. But the world does not view him as such; but that his efforts were Herculean blows struck at the absurdities of the English Church and other existing sects, and that he more nearly reflected the truth and beauty of the primitive faith than had his predecessors at reform. The adulations of the world were, and are, heaped upon Mr. Wesley as having turned to a brighter page in the line of progress, — revealed a better faith than his progenitors in church building.

But who was this Mr. John Wesley, and by what authority did he start a new church, a new order of things? He was a member of the Episcopal Church of England — lived and died in that church. He lived in an already reformed church.

Like Luther, Calvin, Knox, Menno Simon, Henry

the Eighth, and others, he set to work, according to his own fancy and sense of what was right and proper, to effect a reform within a reformed church.

After some years at church building, we have the following, written by his own hand, Feb. 3, 1738 :—

“I went to America to convert the Indians; but oh, who shall convert me! Who is this that will deliver me from this evil heart of unbelief?”

Again :—

“It is over two years since I left my own country to teach the Georgian Indians the nature of Christianity; but what have I learned myself in the mean time? Why (what I least of all suspected), that I, who went to America to *convert others*, was never converted myself. I am not mad though I thus speak, but I speak the words of truth and soberness.”

In his Journal, page 56, he says :—

“This, then, I have learned in the ends of the earth: that I am fallen short of the glory of God; that my whole heart is *altogether corrupt* and abominable, consequently my *whole life* (seeing that an evil tree cannot bring forth good fruit); that alienated from the life of God as I am, I am a child of wrath, an heir of hell.”—RICHARD WATSON’S *History of John Wesley*, pages 46 and 56.

Nine years before the above was written there was founded at Oxford, England, by this man who announced himself an “evil tree,” an “unconverted man,” an “heir of hell,” the Methodist Episcopal Church of England, and thence of America.

In proof, see the following :—

“On Monday, May 1, our little society began in London. But it may be observed, the *first rise of Methodism*, so called.

was in November, 1729, when four of us met together at Oxford." — *Methodist Discipline*, page 3.

What a stride at reformation and church building! After nine years of hard labor and experience, the author announces himself "unconverted," an "evil tree," "a child of wrath," and an "heir of hell."

This is no biased picture. It was written with his own hand. Is this the man that has established the true order of things on this side of the great wilderness of darkness that has intervened between us and the apostles? Common-sense says, No. Did he claim that God had commissioned him to set up his church, or restore it? Hear him: —

"When their champion (Mr. Nash) appeared, coming close to me, asked by *what authority* I did these things, I replied, 'By the authority of Jesus Christ, *conveyed to me* by the (now) Archbishop of Canterbury, when he laid his hands upon me and said, "*Take thou authority to preach the gospel.*"' " — RICHARD WATSON'S *History*, page 75.

Here, then, in the town of Bath, in the year 1739, in reply to an inquiry by Mr. Nash, Mr. Wesley states emphatically that the authority which he received to preach the gospel (and of course found churches) "was conveyed to me by the (now) Archbishop of Canterbury." If the Archbishop had been interrogated as to his authority, he would have answered that he received it directly, or indirectly, from the pope of Rome. Had the pope been asked regarding his, he would have made answer, "It came down to me through the line of the popes, all the way from the great Peter." Hav-

ing, according to Protestant claim, been transmitted through darkness, avarice, tyranny, war, vice, and bloodshed, and, too, while the Baptists had the kingdom of God "shut up in their bosoms," and the great world could not find them anywhere. No wonder there was an inscription seen, "Mystery, Babylon!"

Again : —

" 'It indeed has been proposed,' says Mr. Wesley, 'to desire an English bishop to ordain part of our preachers for America. But to this I object. I desired the bishop of London to ordain only one; but I could not prevail on him. If they ordain now, they will expect to govern.' " — RICHARD WATSON'S *History*, page 245.

Fear of losing power and influence in governing was the ground of objection urged against securing an English bishop to aid in the ordinations; thus showing that the recognized authority for church building by Mr. Wesley came from Rome, through the bishop of London or the English Church.

But if the bishop of London had ordained some of Mr. Wesley's ministry, what of it? They, too, doubt their own right and authority to ordain, and are all perplexed about the situation. See the following, delivered at Washington City, D. C., Sept. 30, 1883 : —

" Monsignor Capel, the celebrated English prelate, lectured at the National Theatre, this evening, on the 'Present Aspect of Religious Belief in England.' So great was the desire to hear him that people were turned away from the doors. Senator Jones, of Florida, introduced the lecturer, and in the audience were many people whose names are familiar to the nation. After tracing in detail the history of religious beliefs in England, from the period of the Reformation, — which he regarded as a

sham imposed by rulers, not a movement of the people, down to the present time,— he described the attitude of the different religious beliefs as they were arrayed in England to-day.

“The Roman Catholic Church, while embracing as yet but a small part of the English people, has at last attained a position where it is respected, and no longer forced to conceal itself. The drift of dogma and belief in the Established Church is toward Rome. The ceremonies of the Roman Catholic ritual are gradually becoming engrafted upon the ritual of the English Church, by whose followers they are practised with even more precision than in the true Church of Rome. Episcopal clergymen are beginning to doubt the divinity of their ordinations, and seek to be admitted to the Roman Catholic Church, where they are rebaptized, reconfirmed, and ordained anew by the representatives of the pope.

“The lecturer made the astounding statement that during a period of a few months three hundred clergymen of the Church of England had become members of the Roman Catholic Church. This movement toward Rome is going on among the upper ten; thousands who have hitherto been, because of the lack of a commingling of classes of society, as in this country, inaccessible to the humbler elements which compose the Church of Rome, which are in the main hewers of wood and carriers of water, and gradually the extremes of social distinctions are being brought together under the banner of Rome. Were the grasp of the state to be taken off the Established Church it would crumble to pieces, not because of attacks from without, but because of efforts from within. Science is advancing its claims, and gradually, though surely, many of the people are drifting toward revolution, rationalism, agnosticism, and the various forms of infidelity. Soon there will be but two religious parties in England: on the one hand the Roman Catholic Church, and on the other rationalism and agnosticism.”—*Cleveland Herald Special*.

Mr. Wesley ordained persons himself, as ministers for his church. While considering American missions —

“He solemnly set apart, by the imposition of his hands and prayer, one of them, viz., Sir Thomas Coke, doctor of law, late of Jesus College, in the University of Oxford, and a presbyter of the Church of England, for the Episcopal office, and having delivered to him letters of Episcopal orders, commissioned and directed him to set apart Francis Asbury, then general assistant of the Methodist Society in America, for the same Episcopal office, he, Francis Asbury, being first ordained deacon and elder.” — *Methodist Discipline*, published by Wright & Swornstadt.

“Dr. Coke was [at the time of his ordination by Mr. Wesley] a presbyter of the Church of England, having received his ordination from the bishop of London. Mr. Wesley was also a presbyter of the same church. They were clothed with equal powers. The same kind of priesthood.

“Wesley desired to send some preachers to America. Richard Whatcoat and Thomas Vosey offered themselves as missionaries for that purpose and were accepted. At Bristol, July 27, 1784, Mr. Wesley ordained them presbyters for America. He afterwards ordained Dr. Coke superintendent or bishop.” — DANIEL RUPP’S *History of Religious Denominations in the United States*, page 279.

After the arrival of Dr. Coke and party in America, at a conference convened at Baltimore, Dec. 25, 1784, “Dr. Coke, assisted by several elders, set him [Mr. Francis Asbury] apart, by the imposition of hands, as bishop of the Episcopal Church.”

The following is the certificate of his ordination:—

“Know all men by these presents, that I, Thomas Coke, doctor of civil law, late of Jesus College, in the University of Oxford, presbytery of the Church of England, and superintendent of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America, . . . by the imposition of my hands and prayer (being assisted by two ordained elders) did, on the twenty-fifth day of the month (December), set apart Francis Asbury to the office of a deacon

in the aforesaid Methodist Episcopal Church. And also on the twenty-sixth day of the said month did, by the imposition of my hands and prayer (being assisted by the said elders), set apart the said Francis Asbury for the office of elder in the said Methodist Episcopal Church, and on this the twenty-seventh day of the said month, being the day of the date thereof, have, by the imposition of my hands and prayer (being assisted by said elders), set apart Francis Asbury for the office of superintendent in the said Methodist Episcopal Church. . . . In testimony hereof I hereunto set my hand and seal this twenty-seventh day of December, 1784." — THOMAS COKE, *Life and Times of Francis Asbury*, pages 147 and 148.

Allowing this certificate to speak for itself, — and the Doctor had quite a time of it in conferring authority upon Mr. Asbury and raising him to the office of bishop, — the ordinations were regular and formal. But the important question to be considered is, *Whence the authority conferred?* The "office of superintendent," here, is the same as that of bishop. So that after this transaction it is Bishop Asbury. Mr. Asbury then took the lead in ordaining persons to offices in the Methodist Episcopal Church in America. Thus the steps in the line of transmitted authority, so far as relates to the Methodist Church in England and America, are plain and easily seen; viz., the Methodist Episcopal Church in America received its apostolic authority from Mr. Asbury; Mr. Asbury from Dr. Coke; Dr. Coke from Mr. Wesley; Mr. Wesley from the Archbishop of Canterbury; and the Archbishop of Canterbury from the pope of Rome, whom the whole Protestant world denounces as the "man of sin" and "son of perdition."

No wonder, then, that the Methodist Church, in her organization and doctrine, does not conform to the apostolic pattern! Having been founded in the wisdom of men and authorized by Episcopal England and Catholic Rome, she could rise no higher than the source whence she received her authority and right.

The first Methodist conference was held in 1744. He (Mr. Wesley) and all of his ministers adhered to the Church of England. He would not allow his ministers to baptize or administer the sacrament. (MARSH, page 422.)

“Until the close of the Revolutionary War, the system of Methodism was according to the plan of Wesley. The preachers were not empowered to administer ordinances, and the people were obliged to go to other churches. As the United States had now become independent of Great Britain, Wesley determined to make the American churches independent, and sent Dr. Coke, commissioned as a superintendent or bishop, to constitute the American churches independent; to raise Mr. Asbury to the same office, and to ordain preachers and elders. He arrived in 1784, and on the 25th of December constituted Mr. Asbury to the office of bishop.” — MARSH, page 423.

She made no claims to the restoration of the priesthood from heaven, or a divine revelation authorizing her to act, but repudiated the necessity for either, and announced to the world, that “We are but a band of brethren having a form (not *the* form) of godliness, and seeking the power.”

#### THE FRIENDS OR QUAKERS.

This sect “had its origin with a man that was brought up with the Established Church (Church of England),



and he was of honest and respectable parents. "In 1646, he entirely forsook the National Church." "By reason of the convulsions which they labored under when they delivered their discourses, they were called Quakers. Mr. George Fox, the prime mover in the organization, wandered about, often in retired places, with only a Bible for a companion, encouraging people to wait patiently to feel the power to stir in their hearts." He claimed divine directions, and soon great numbers followed him.\*

It is evident that all the authority given to this society was received from the Catholic Church through that of the Church of England. As they rejected the ordinances of the gospel, it is evident that they were not divinely authorized as a church, for John says: "Whosoever trangresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God." (2 John ix.)

Their spirit manifestations, also, as seen in the quaking, contortion, jerking, and convulsing of the body, bear no resemblance to the peaceful promptings of the Spirit that moved the ancient saints to prophesy, speak in tongues, see visions, etc., as shown forth in the New Testament, hence should be rejected.

All of the minor sects that have arisen grew out of or from among these older ones, and can boast of no priesthood or authority not found in them, namely, the Moravians, Shakers, United Brethren, Adventists, Christadelphians, Universalists, Mennonites, followers of Emmanuel Swedenborg, etc., hence all, alike, destitute of priesthood and authority except what came from Rome.

---

\* Fox's Book of Martyrs, pages 354 and 355.

## THE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH.

We come now to consider, if possible, a more daring set of claimants of ecclesiastical powers than any yet mentioned. That is the Congregationalists, or Independents; those holding the view that individual congregations have the authority and right to bestow upon its members, at will, the sacred offices. This did neither Jesus nor the apostles.

That there was divine authority placed in the church at Jerusalem, in order that the administration of its laws might be legal, is clear from the New Testament. That this authority was transmissible, so long as men should remain righteous, and be found worthy to be stewards of such a heavenly treasure, has been proven. It has also been shown that this authority was taken from men, because of their wickedness, and a long night of darkness ensued; that the pompous claims of the pope, as having succeeded to the keys of St. Peter by succession, is an assumption, he being as destitute of the power of the priesthood as the king of Siam; and per consequence, all who claim to have received divine power through him are alike *destitute of authority*, based upon the hypothesis, nothing from nothing and nothing remains.

The present age of enlightenment has awakened an investigation of popish claims to divine authority, and the world is being convinced that he succeeded to the authority of the apostles only in name; that, in reality, he has no more divine power than Mahomet; and as a necessity, that none who claim it through him have any.

A great many becoming thus convinced that there has been no authority handed down from the apostles, on account of wickedness and apostasy, and that God has given none from heaven (for all believe that he does not reveal himself now as in former times), the conclusion has been arrived at that *any* man has a right to officiate in the name of God who feels disposed so to do ; and that any congregation has the authority within itself to ordain and send men to preach the gospel as it may choose, independent of a call from God, or the conferring of the priesthood. That a direct call from God and a consecration to the priesthood were essential in primitive times, they may admit, but that such a course is not necessary now, although strictly lawful anciently.

But notwithstanding this hasty conclusion, in all fairness, we confess to being unable to find a single precedent, in all the Bible, for such a course. The great guide bequeathed to us by the ancient apostles and saints, which reveals God's acknowledged order, does not furnish us with a single text in favor of the *Congregational scheme*.

True, in the Book of Judges, seventeenth chapter, we read that "There was a man of mount Ephraim, whose name was Micah. And he said unto his mother, The eleven hundred shekels of silver that were taken from thee, about which thou cursedst, and spakest of also in mine ears, behold, the silver is with me ; I took it." This man, Micah, restored the silver, and his mother had made of them two images, "and they were in the house of Micah. And the man Micah

had a house of gods, and made an ephod, and a teraphim, and consecrated one of his sons, who became his priest. . . . And Micah consecrated the Levite; and the young man became his priest, and was in the house of Micah."

Here, indeed, is an instance of a Congregational-made priest, and the reason is obvious from the sixth verse, "Every man did that which was right in his own eyes."

This thief, Micah, going according to that which was "right in his own eyes" (as do the Congregationalists or Independents), consecrated two men to offer up incense to idol gods. For the credit of Congregationalists themselves, it is to be hoped that they will not refer to Micah as a righteous precedent to support their claim.

Again, Korah and Dathan seemed to have imbibed the Congregational scheme; holding that the power was in a congregation to honor with a commission whomsoever they pleased, irrespective of God's called and ordained.

"And they gathered themselves together against Moses and against Aaron, and said unto them, Ye take too much upon you, seeing all the congregation are holy, every one of them, and the Lord is among them: wherefore then lift ye up yourselves above the congregation of the Lord?" — Num. xvi. 3.

It is plain from this that Korah and Dathan, through jealousy, envy, and blind ambition, thought to array the camp of Israel against Moses and Aaron, by flattering them with the belief that the right to appoint a leader, and empower him to treat with God, was vested in the

*congregation*. Said they, "Wherefore then lift ye up yourselves above the congregation?" having reference to the high power and honors conferred upon those men by the Almighty, to empower them to instruct and lead Israel. In a word, they thought to ignore God's plan and authority, and set up a man-made priesthood, *vested in a congregation*; the very scheme that is so flauntingly held to by the modern Independents.

Go and learn the fate of Korah and Dathan, and say no more that congregations can assume the power of the sacred offices of the priesthood with impunity, and thus endow themselves with God's power.

Another instance of man-instituted authority is given in 1 Kings xiii. 33 : —

"After this thing Jeroboam returned not from his evil way, but made again of the lowest of the people, priests of the high places; whosoever would, he consecrated him, and he became one of the priests of the high places."

But a sufficient comment upon this is furnished in the next verse : —

"And this thing became sin unto the house of Jeroboam, even to cut it off, and to destroy it from the face of the earth."

During the continuance of the long era of apostasy that ensued after the death of the apostles, there has none more clearly fulfilled the prophecy of St. Paul (2 Tim. iv. 3), than those who hold the Congregational scheme. He said : —

"For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine, but after their own lusts shall they *heap* to themselves *teachers*, having itching ears."

This prophecy refers to a time when men would arrogate to themselves (Micah-like) the power to make ministers (teachers), and disdaining the idea of acceding to transmitted power, or divine appointment, would assume (Korah and Dathan like) that congregations have the power to authorize and set apart teachers at will; hence, would multiply teacher after teacher, until they are to "*heap* to themselves teachers"; the prerequisites to a proper commission consisting of fluent speech and the popular vote of an enthusiastic assembly.

This mode has become so popular, although destitute of sacred sanction, that men do not scruple to avow it to be God's only appointed way of choosing.

It is no wonder that they exist in heaps! And like Micah's priests, they are hired, "Ten shekels of silver by the year, and a suit of apparel and their victuals,"—bread and butter. By and by, when Micah's priest heard of higher wages and a more desirable living elsewhere, he was *called* away from Micah; called into another vineyard. (Judges xviii.)

There is such a perfect likeness in the manner of calling Micah's priest and these modern heaped-up teachers, that one is at a loss to know which is most likely to meet with divine approval, so far as the call and ordination is concerned.

"Congregationalism, a designation assumed of late years by the religious denomination formerly known as Independents. . . . The negative Independent implied chiefly a renunciation of the authority of the pope, prelate, presbytery, prince, or Parliament, and thus brought into prominence the antagonistic positions of the churches so named towards National, Episco-

pal, and Presbyterian churches. The word 'congregational' has been now almost universally substituted for it, to indicate more clearly the brotherhood and fellowship maintained in their separate communities."

The ministers of the Congregationalists or Independents are called as follows : —

"And the call to his office comes through the people; the divine choice is expressed through the men, the divine word enlightens, and the divine Spirit guides. Their theology has been predominantly Calvinistic, though of the more moderate type." — *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Vol. VI., page 268; Vol. VII., page 728.

The first Congregational church of the "English Reformation" was built by Richard Fitz, in the Bridewell of the city of London. John Robinson was a minister of the Church of England, but inclined to "Puritan doctrines, and in 1604 he formally withdrew from the national church and identified himself with the Puritans." He was one of the earliest workers among the Congregationalists.

"*Puritans*, a name given to a large party in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, who complained that the Reformation in England was left in an imperfect state, many abuses, both in worship and discipline, being still retained. The name 'Puritan' was derived from the frequent assertion of those who composed the party, that the Church of England was corrupted with the remains of popery."

"The greater number of the Puritans, however, were either Presbyterians, or still retained their connection with the Church of England." — *Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Cyclopædia*, pages 804, 808.

Puritans of Plymouth were most all ordained ministers in the Church of England.\*

## THE DISCIPLE CHURCH.

But the most noisy and blustering class and greatest sticklers for the congregational scheme, that the writer has personally had to do with, is the sect styling themselves, "Disciples," "Reformers," or "Christian Church," better known as Campbellites.

Whatever their assumed denominational name, it is a fact, beyond question, that Bishop Campbell was the originator and founder of that system of faith and worship. In evidence of this, I cite the testimony of a prominent minister and writer of that church, the Rev. W. T. Moore, pastor of the Christian Church, corner of Eighth and Walnut Streets, Cincinnati, Ohio.

In a sermon delivered by him on Radicalism and Conservatism, which was published in pamphlet form at the earnest request of his audience, after speaking in glowing terms of several eminent men, such as Wesley, Melancthon, Luther, Washington, Gray, and others, he says of Mr. Campbell:—

"Alexander Campbell is a fine example among religious reformers. . . . I sincerely believe that history will yet record him as one of the greatest men that ever lived. . . . *His religious system* united theory and practice. . . . His success as a *discoverer* of the truth was very great, but his power to *organize* and make practical what was already known appeared equally prominent. But if any should be sceptical as to the extent of his power, let such a person remember that *he began his reformation* with every religious party in Christendom arrayed against him; that *he fought* the battles of truth singly and alone, and against the *combined armies of sectarianism*, headed by the pope of Rome, and cheered on by all the hosts of *Protestantism*; and that in the short space of forty years the little band of disciples



which *he organized*, upon the 'Bible and Bible alone,' has grown to be one of the most powerful religious bodies in all the land. . . . But so far as human instrumentality was concerned, *it cannot be DENIED* that Campbell was *the man* who CONCEIVED, *organized, and made SUCCESSFUL* the present reformation."

What a confession! Wonderful, indeed! So far as "human instrumentality was concerned," Luther conceived and organized his reformation, as did Calvin, Irving, Moravius, Swedenborg, and others; all, like Mr. Campbell, *conceived and organized by human wisdom* the respective denominations which now bear their names. Why the element put into Mr. Campbell's organization refuse to be called by the name of the man who "conceived," "organized," and "made successful" their peculiar church is, to say the least, strange.

But to the history of the organization itself. I quote from the works of Barton W. Stone:—

"At the end of six years, in 1832, Elder John T. Johnson became co-editor of the *Messenger* with him; and so continued till Bro. Stone removed to Illinois. Just before J. T. Johnson became co-editor of the *Messenger*, a union was effected between the Christians, with Bro. Stone and the Reformers, so called, who had come off from the Baptists in Kentucky,—who had come off through the labors of A. Campbell and those with him. They accepted the same foundation, and could not do otherwise than unite together when they came to understand each other. And to cement and make permanent this union, two distinguished elders were chosen to ride through the churches and labor together,—John Smith, formerly a Baptist, and John Rogers, of the Christian body."

From the above is shown that those under the leadership of Mr. Campbell were called Reformers, and

those under B. W. Stone, Christians; that prior to their union Mr. Campbell's party had broken off from the Baptists, and Mr. Stone's from the Presbyterians, for whom he had preached for years. After their union, a man from the Baptist division and one from the Presbyterian side were chosen to watch over the flock. We ask, now, by what authority did this Baptist and Presbyterian union minister? And are answered, "By the authority they had received from their respective churches, who had received it in a direct line from the pope of Rome." Hence we are forced to the conclusion, sad as it may appear, that in this *joint union* there was constituted, by the authority (if by any at all) of the old mother church, one of her *great-grand-daughters*.

After a time the leaders, in order to render themselves more independent still, ignored the claim of transmitted power; and claiming none direct from God, they were left *free and unfettered*, to DO AS THEY PLEASED. Hear Mr. Stone:—

"Some time after the new organization had been inaugurated, he became dissatisfied with his infant sprinkling; the brethren, elders, and teachers came together on the subject, for we had agreed previously with each other to act in concert and not to adventure anything new without advice from one another. At this meeting we took up the matter in a brotherly spirit, and concluded that every brother and sister should act freely and according to their conviction of right, and that we should cultivate the long-neglected grace of forbearance towards each other: those who were immersed should not despise those who were sprinkled, and *vice versa*. Now the question arose, who will baptize us? The Baptist would not, unless we would unite with them, and there were no elders among us who had been

immersed. It was finally concluded among us, that if we had authority to preach we had authority to baptize. The work then commenced. The preachers baptized one another, and crowds came and were also baptized."

From the above is shown something of the rise of the organization, said to be built upon the "Bible and Bible alone."

Who authorized it? Who endowed it with authority to administer the gospel ordinances? Why, the people met together in council — all had a voice; they concluded that *if* they had authority to *preach*, they had authority to *baptize*; so the work commenced. Neither God, angels, the Holy Spirit, nor the Bible gave any advice as either authorizing or sanctioning their projected scheme. Thus, the great fabric, said to be built on the "Bible and Bible alone," really rests upon an *IF*; that little word which changes the course of everything, and apologizes for everybody.

*If* Lucifer had not rebelled, he would have remained an angel of light. *If* Adam had not sinned, he would have remained in Paradise. *If* Moses had not died on the other side, he might have gone over the Jordan into Canaan. Individuals joining the Disciple Church will assuredly go to heaven, *IF* they are not found to be facing towards a warmer department — caught in the wrong net.

The Disciples profess to be built on the "Bible and Bible alone." But who authorized Mr. Campbell to build a church on the Bible alone? Did God call upon him and authorize him thus to act? No; he did not so claim. Neither did he believe in transmitted authority

through any line from the apostles. Does it say anywhere in the Bible, that in the nineteenth century, Mr. Campbell should organize the *true* church? Answer: No; nothing of the kind is said. Does it say anywhere in the Bible that God would call Barton W. Stone, Mr. Walter Scott, or A. Campbell even unto the ministry? Answer: Nowhere is it so written. Did He call them by a special revelation? Answer: N6; they did not believe He could reveal himself in this age. Is their church said to be built on the "Bible alone," after the pattern of the church established by Jesus and the apostles? Oh, no! It is no more like the apostolic organization than the Methodist, Baptist, or Presbyterian churches. Did God, in any age or time, since the world began, authorize a man, or set of men, to build his church on the "Bible alone"? Answer: No; not at any time.

In the church of Christ there existed the Melchisedec and Aaronic priesthoods, apostles, prophets, the Holy Ghost, visions, dreams, revelations, etc., but none of these are found in the Disciple Church. There was also a call to the ministry, by God himself, in the Jerusalem church; in the Disciple Church there is nothing of this kind. They even reject the Holy Ghost, and affirm that there is no such thing now to be seen, heard, or felt, by Christians, only as appears in the written word—the letter. They repudiate both transmitted and revealed claims to authority.

Then, these men *took upon themselves the great honor of founding a church.*

What says the Bible about such arrogance? It is written in 2 Samuel that Saul assumed the authority

to act in a sacred office to which he never had been called, and because of his haughty assumption God took the kingdom from him and gave it to David.

What, then, must be the final end of those who do not hesitate to affirm that *any person*, of the laity or clergy, has an undisputed right to go out, as each may see fit, and preach and administer in the gospel ordinances, build up societies and preside over them, without a call from God, as had Aaron; without a commission from heaven, as Jesus and the apostles received; without an ordination to the priesthood, as was required of the ancient saints, that they might be qualified ambassadors of Christ, whereby they became a "holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices"? (1 Peter ii. 5.) And the avowed claim of these *assumers* of authority and right to occupy sacred positions is that *if* they have authority to *preach*, they have authority to *baptize*. Who sends them? Why, they send themselves. No higher claim is made. A *congregation* by its *vote* empowers them.

When the Saviour sent forth his ministry he informed them that "Whosoever receiveth you, receiveth me; and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me." (Matt. x. 40.) The Father sent the Son, and the Son sent his ministry; and they who received his ministry, received both Father and Son, because Father and Son sent them.

The Disciples, with all congregationalists, go forth and tell the people, "Whoever receives us, receiveth those who sent us." Query: Who sent them? Answer: Their congregations sent them by the authority of a

popular vote. Hence, when the people received them, they received them and their respective congregations who authorized them to preach. Therefore, believers in that system must *trust to man* for life and salvation ; for man is the *summum ad bonum* of the congregational scheme ; there is no higher source giving sanction to the system.

Paul says : —

“ As God hath distributed to every man, as the Lord hath called every one, so let him walk. And so ordain I in all churches.” — 1 Cor. vii. 17.

But the Disciples do not wait for the Lord to call them, but they send themselves, with or without an ordination, as suits their fancy.

Again he says : —

“ Having, then, gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith; or ministry, let us wait on our ministering; or he that teacheth, on teaching.” — Rom. xii. 6, 7.

Thus, as God gave *gifts* to “ prophecy,” or “ minister,” so the saints were to exercise in accordance with the *call* and *bestowed gifts*; but the congregationalists make ministers of everybody (even women), object to prophecy, and ask no conferred gifts from God to enable them to preach.

Again Paul says : —

“ Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers.” — Acts xx. 28.

The Disciples ignore the appointment by the Holy

Ghost, and set themselves over the flock. They truly *take heed unto themselves*, at the expense of the flock.

The Saviour says : —

“Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.” — Mark xvi. 15.

The so-called Disciples go to congregations and tell the people that for a stipulated price they will preach in that immediate neighborhood at stated times for one year. If sufficient is promised, backed up by an accepted security, they will enter upon their mission field. If there is not a sufficient forthcoming, like Micah's priest they look out for more congenial climes — “take heed unto themselves.”

Paul labored with his hands that the “gospel might be free”; these men have *set prices* for preaching a sermon, and if they do not get their price, *they will not preach*. The writer was informed by one of their number, not long since, that his price was ten dollars a sermon, but there were two other preachers in his neighborhood who charged, one eight, and the other five dollars a sermon.

Offering reward according to merit, who can guess how much more Paul ought to have had than Peter? or James than Thomas? Or, how much more it would have taken to have bought John, for a year, than Matthias? Rome and Greece perhaps would have bid high on Paul and Timothy.

Having said so much with reference to the Disciples, it is but just to remark that what has been said of

them, concerning *authority*, applies equally to all who hold to the "congregational scheme."

Thus, in consecutive order, I have noticed the Catholic Church, with several of the most reputed and famed organizations that sprang out of her, together with those claiming to be Congregationalists or Independents, down to that of the Disciple Church; all of which have imbibed more or less of the spirit of intolerance, pride, and selfishness that characterized the old mother, excepting always the noble men and women who have wrought, independently of creed, for the rights of men and the world's progress. War and conflict have been the order all the way from the rise of the Reformation. When there were no Catholics to contend with, the conflict has been between the Protestants themselves, creed against creed. No telling what condition the world would have been in were it not that the great organizations, or sects, jealously watch each other's progress and power.

The pope would issue bulls against all who had sufficient courage to oppose his usurpations and haughty dictations, and would brand them "heretics," bar his churches against them, and thus cut off free investigation. He inaugurated the Inquisition as a school of reform, and by racking, cutting, burning, and in a thousand ways lacerated human beings, to enforce a recantation of avowed religious opinions, which, if refused, they were punished even unto death. Hence, hundreds and thousands lost their lives under the unholy and iron rule of "The Mother of Harlots." The daughters received in a modified form of her spirit and disposition.



The law being against their inaugurating the Inquisition and inflicting corporal punishments, they resort to intimidation, to closing their churches against those holding different religious views to themselves; forbid their members going to hear any except their own preachers; teach their children not to associate with and properly respect those not of their faith, and encourage them in pointing the finger of scorn at them because of not belonging to their creed; restrict them to reading only those books, catechisms, and papers put out by their favorite sect; encourage the nicknaming of others' children because their parents hold to another religious faith not so popular and powerful as their own; will exclude from office those worthy and competent because they are not of their faith; at the same time hold that if a man is only conscientious in his religious belief he is all right any way. Some will go so far as to band together and stealthily move upon people at the dead hours of night, — catch them, strip them, and tar and feather them, and thus oppose, discourage, menace, and throw every possible obstacle in their way because they do not subscribe to their rules of faith and doctrine; pass them by, sneer at and socially ostracize them from their company. Upon the top of all of this they will style themselves "disciples of Christ," "followers of the meek and lowly Jesus," who was put out of synagogues but never put anybody out, frowned down and looked upon with contempt, but bore it patiently; whose sublime teaching was ever, "As ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them."

These practices, so common among Protestant socie-

ties and their members, show conclusively that the Reformation has not gone quite far enough; that it has not attained the high ground sought for; that still there is room for improvement, a forward movement to be made, ere the Protestants attain that unity and Christ-like spirit so essential to be unmistakably his.

Jesus said, "If a house be divided against itself, that house cannot stand." (Mark iii. 25.) "Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation." (Matt. xii. 25.) This divided and contending condition of the Protestant world is viewed with alarm and lamented by their wisest and most conscientious apologists. Might as well try to make sensible men believe that light is darkness and darkness light, as to try to convince them that this rivalry and conflict, this jealousy and envy, this dislike and hatred of each other, are going on in the recognized church of God. The following indicates what others think of this condition of Christendom. It is rather the results of the reign of old "mystery, Babylon" — confusion — than the workings and manifestations of the true Christian spirit and graces.

"A PERIL TO CHRISTIANITY. — A discussion of great importance is going on in the present time in China respecting the conflict of the Protestant sects as to what Christianity is. There are forty different Protestant bodies competing independently for the converts in the Chinese Empire. The larger and better established of these organizations have all the way from 1247 to 9285 communicants. The chief religious bodies are Presbyterian, Congregational, Methodist, Episcopal, and Baptist. Each of these carries into the Chinese mission field the porcupine quills with which it is accustomed to wound

Christian brethren of other names at home. The efforts of the missionaries in China repeat the bad and injurious features of Christianity as faithfully as they represent its beneficent work; they load down the heathen world with the Christian contradictions of our latest religious civilization, and interfere and cut up one another with the same ferocity in the heathen world that they carry on their religious conflicts here at home. . . . There is no agreement, no co-operation, but each one takes up work wherever he can find a chance to start it, with the result that confusion reigns everywhere, with constant interference, and with a waste of effort that is both painful in itself and extremely costly to the missionary boards at home. The first native Protestant church in Japan was organized in 1872, and at the end of 1888 there were over 28,000 church members. The unity in Japan among Protestant workers has been no greater than that to be found in China, though the country is more concentrated in population and has been vastly more under the influence of modern civilization; but even here the complaint has been that the *confusion in religious teaching was a hindrance to the advance of Christianity*, and at this very moment there is a demand among the Japanese for a native church in which Christianity shall be lifted above its present sectarian manifestations.

*"The peril to Christianity in both China and Japan, so far as Protestant work is concerned, is very great, from the prevalence of the discordant elements which constitute the religious embarrassment in Europe and America. What must intelligent Chinamen or keen-witted Japanese think of a Christianity which is represented by so many sects? How can the Christian religion make headway when the variations of Protestantism are as repugnant to the common-sense of the heathen as they were embarrassing to Bossuet on his attempt to reconcile them with the Roman Catholic Church? Missionary work in our Western towns is so degraded by competitions among Christians for 'corner lots' for churches that the intelligent Western man is in danger of losing his respect for Christianity entirely, when he sees its principles put to shame by the rival-*

ries of its representatives; but this does not begin to be so bad as the impression which a disciple of Confucius must receive when he sees Protestant Christians going to war 'at a woful, shattered, tattered, sorry disadvantage.' Dr. Alexander Williamson, a veteran Chinese missionary, puts the case of disagreement very forcibly in a recent appeal, where he says: 'We have three branches of the Episcopal Church, eight different sects of Presbyterians, six sects of Methodists, two Congregationalists, two Baptists, beside several other minor bodies, all acting independently of each other.' When John Chinaman is asked to become a Christian, he says plainly: 'Agree among yourselves, and then we will listen to you.' This judgment is met with as much in Japan as in China; but in the latter country, under the new constitution, it is possible that before a great while a native Japanese church may grow out of the existing Christianity and fuse the present Protestant elements into one living and consistent whole. Under such treatment Japan would become essentially a Christian nation; but in the Empire of China, which could absorb, perhaps, thirty Japans, and where the Christian population, both Protestant and Roman Catholic, is only an iota of the whole population, no such national organization of religion is possible. The most that can be done for the different denominations of Christians is to consent to drop their sectarian ideas, and constitute for themselves a religious basis that stands for the working agreements of Christianity. This is as far as they can go, and, unless they go thus far, it is a serious question whether the missionary investments are directly worth while. Indirectly, the missionaries in China have done more than any others to open that empire to Western civilization; but this is incidental to their missionary principle, not the main thing for which they were established. It will remove a great difficulty if Protestant Christians can be made to see, from the point where they now stand, that in their present divided state they can never Christianize China." — *Boston Herald*.

While it may be true that no formal declaration has been made by any one of the great denominations to

carry on the kind of ostracism, resentment, and persecution mentioned, yet they have condoned and winked at such practices when done by the members of their respective societies, which virtually commits them as sanctioning such kind of works. Minorities and small organizations have been made to suffer constantly from the encroachment and domination of the older, larger, and more successful ones ; more especially if apparent that the new had within it the elements of success and rivalry. Indeed, the advancement, toleration, freedom, and true enlightenment attained in modern civilization may be attributed largely to the rivalry of the larger sects, the jealousy of each other's success, their conflict with scepticism, and scepticism contending for liberty and freedom against them, rather than a conscientious presentation, unfolding and following of the true Gospel principles of freedom, toleration, and the rights of men set out in the New Testament. Infidels are sought and preferred for political honors rather than church men, because of their non-partisan spirit and avowed toleration. No one denomination implicitly confides in another. Each seeks, with opportunity, to intrench and make stronger financially his own denomination, at the expense of others.

It is claimed that the true church of Christ is embraced in all of the sects, not in any one of them ; that a conscientious worship is a true worship, however far removed from the fundamental Christian doctrines, taught by the Master and in whatever church, only that they profess a faith in him. Indeed it is strongly advocated, by many, that doctrine is a hin-

derance to the Christian cause — non-essential. They seem to forget that Paul wrote that “the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine” (2 Tim. iv. 3), and to “Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee.” (1 Tim. iv. 16.)

If the claim be true that the true Christian church is embraced in all of the Christian sects, so called, why all this rivalry between them? Why not build up one department just as well as another? Why not dedicate churches for all denominations and declare for a free pulpit rather than to “our worship only,” or to a few of the larger and more influential sects who are willing to join the “Evangelical Alliance” just because each is bound to respect the other by reason of its numbers, power, and influence? Whoever heard tell of an “Evangelical Alliance” in the church of God? In the church of Jesus Christ the members, including all of the parts, were united upon the basis of doctrine, spirit, and a oneness characteristic of the institution itself. They were constitutionally one. Divisions and discords were the unnatural condition, signs of deterioration to end, if persisted in, in final rejection. So we read:—

“Mark them which cause division and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them.”—Rom. xvi. 17. (See Acts xv. 1, 5, 24; 1 Tim. vi. 3; 1 Cor. iii.; 1 Tim. i. 3; Gal. i.; 2 Cor. xi. 4.)

“For whereas there is among you envying, and strife, and divisions, are ye not carnal, and walk as men?”—1 Cor. iii. 3.

“Be of the same mind one toward another.”—Rom. xii. 16.

These sects and divisions are unnatural growths. They do not exist as a necessity or as component parts in their discordant party strife of the Christian institution. The pompous claim that these constitute the true Christian church, or that it is composed of them, can be nothing more than a sheer make-believe.

But, reader, are you startled? Have you lost sight of your guide which you held in your hand when we began exploring the dark regions of "mystery, Babylon" in search of the true order of God? Are you discouraged, and about to accept some of these man-made institutions, built on creeds, as the church of Christ, which in many respects are but so many institutions of gain? Let me exhort you at this trying hour to be *faithful to your guide*.

In this world, when men unite themselves to any form of government, they are entitled to all the blessings and privileges guaranteed to citizens by the laws of that government. But unless they are made citizens, indeed, they are not so entitled; and this is true, also, of the kingdom of God.

In the Republic of the United States the laws guarantee to its citizens the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; to hold property, receive redress of wrongs, enjoy suffrage, etc. The officers of the Republic are President, Vice-President, senators, judges, representatives, secretaries, etc., all of whom are appointed and authorized by the power inherent in the Republic. If, in the course of a decade of years, the President should be removed, the citizen's vote be taken away, the Senate overturned, and the House of Repre-

sentatives subverted, and a dictator placed at the head of the government, would it be any longer the beautiful Republic of the United States? Oh, no! it would be something else far different.

This is true, also, of the kingdom of God. Christ is the head of his own kingdom, and has designated its order and authority, — the kind of officers, the code of laws, and the blessings belonging thereto; and he has not at any time authorized men to change his order of government, displace his specified officers, or in anywise change his laws or abrogate his promised blessings. They were to remain intact until the Saviour's coming, if men would but conform to the constitution governing in his church or kingdom. They were given to the church when Peter, James, and John, and others were her crown of stars; a most beautiful and graphic description of which you will find in your guide, — the New Testament.

Her officers were apostles, prophets, evangelists, teachers, pastors, etc.; her laws, faith, repentance, baptisms, the laying on of hands, patience, kindness, love, charity, meekness, humility; her gifts and blessings, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost, knowledge, wisdom, prophecy, healings, tongues, the interpretation of tongues, discerning of spirits, visiting of angels, and communion with God; and her ultimate reward to all of the faithful, a crown of immortality and eternal life. These are the chief points or characteristics by which she can be properly identified.

After having made diligent search among all of the societies and organizations extant, with your guide in



hand, where do you find amidst them all, my friend and reader, an institution in exact accord with the pattern given of Christ's church? Ah, echo answers, — where? Yet one established according to this plan is all that God has ever deigned to acknowledge as his. What will you do? Throw away your guide, and join a daughter of the old mother, or some institution of men? You cannot afford to do this, for by and by you will be required to give an account for your opportunities in this life, and your knowledge of the Word of God. You will need to appear before the great bar, where the judge knows all, — where there will be no chance for evasion. "The word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day," says Jesus. (John xii. 48.) You will remember that he said : —

"These signs shall follow them that believe; In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover." — Mark xvi. 17, 18.

"And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues." — 1 Cor. xii. 28.

"Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save the sick." — Jas. v. 14, 15.

"To one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit; . . . to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit; to another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another divers kinds of tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues." — 1 Cor. xii. 8-10.

“And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: *till we all come in the unity of the faith.*” — Eph. iv. 11-13.

“Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.” — Gal. i. 8.

You will be conscious that the book containing these words, and many more of a similar import, was your guide to the kingdom of heaven in this life. What a great loss you must necessarily suffer, should it turn out that for the sake of popularity, and worldly riches, and fame, you threw away your guide; let others do your thinking; chose darkness rather than hold out for the light; went into “mystery, Babylon,” and joined yourself to an harlot, or one of the institutions of men! Oh, let me exhort you, my dear friend, *to stick to your guide!*

Remember that your guide says, “If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him.” (Jas. i. 5.) “Seek, and ye shall find, knock, and it shall be opened unto you.” “Pray without ceasing,” but be careful not to “ask amiss” to consume upon your lusts.

Tired and discouraged, perhaps, you are ready to exclaim: “With guide in hand, I have surveyed the whole of Christendom, and I have failed to find an organization in harmony with it, or anything approximating it. I want to be saved! I must join something, or I am lost!” Hold, sir! The daughters of

"mystery, Babylon," cannot save you ; neither any institution of men. You are commanded, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness." (Matt. vi. 33.) Move over the face of the earth ; examine organizations, parties, and creeds ; explore the lasting hills ; ride the ocean over, and penetrate the islands of the seas ; scour the whole of God's universe, with his law (guide) in your hand, and if you do not find something in harmony with that pattern, move on until you appear before the great throne ; raise your guide in your hand, and tell the immortal King that you sought a whole lifetime for his church and kingdom, but found nothing but easily detected counterfeits, spurious systems, man-made creeds, etc., and that rather than disrespect his law and stultify your conscience, you joined none of them, and that now you stand before him with a clear conscience as having done the best you could ; that you have retained your manhood, and maintained the dignity of his word against all deceivers and usurpers.

Ah, sir ! I fancy I see now the immortal lyres, golden harps, and heavenly songsters sending forth their sweetest strains ; and angels, cherubim, archangels, and gods, adorned with all the glory and splendor of their celestial armor, forming in line, with all heaven in grand array to give *triumphant entrance* to such a *saint*.

But, perhaps, you have become so weary of seeking, you are about to give up in despair. *Courage, brother ! try once more.*

There is a church extant which is in exact accord with

the one set out in your guide. But in consequence of the great myth — “mystery, Babylon” — surrounding you, you have been led to overlook it. For as to numbers, in comparison with the great and powerful sects extant, it is as a pearl in the ocean, a treasure in a field, a little stone beside a great mountain. It is the *Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints*. For definite distinction, on account of the latter-day apostasy, it is known as the *Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints*.

Again seize your guide, and come forward and test it. If it, like others, is found untrue, leave it behind and seek on. But this you will find to be in exact harmony with your guide, in its inception, organization, and doctrine, and in it you will find peace; rest, and safety.

## CHAPTER X.

### JOSEPH SMITH, JR., AND THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS.

THE chief instrument in the hands of God in the founding of this church was Joseph Smith, Jr. He was born in the year 1805, on the 23d of December, in the town of Sharon, Windsor County, Vt. When about fifteen years of age he was greatly wrought upon in regard to religion, and set about to discover, if possible, the true church of Christ. He had observed with pain and great concern the divisions and discords in the world among the sects. More especially was he made to feel and sense the evil effects of this conflict and contention between the churches as it was brought into his father's family — some favoring one sect, and others another sect. Anxious about his own welfare, but not knowing which church to unite with, on an occasion, while much perplexed in mind, he was reading in the Bible in search of light, and his eyes rested upon the following : —

“ If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him.” — *Jas. i. 5.*

He was too young and confiding to presume that God did not say what he meant, and meant what he

said ; so he retired into a grove and kneeled down and prayed ; and while at prayer a vision was opened to him, and two personages appeared unto him in glory, standing above him in the air. One of them spake unto him, calling him by name, and said, pointing to the other, "This is my beloved Son ; hear him !" The following is his language : —

"My object in going to inquire of the Lord, was to know which of all these sects was right, that I might know which to join. . . . I asked the personages who stood above me in the light, which of all the sects was right, — for at that time it had never entered into my heart that all were wrong, — and which I should join. I was answered that I should join none of them, for they were all wrong ; and the personage who addressed me said that all their creeds were an abomination in his sight, that those professors were all corrupt, 'They draw near me with their lips, but their hearts are far from me ; they teach for doctrine the commandments of men, having a form of godliness, but they deny the power thereof.' He again forbade me to join any of them." — *Times and Seasons*, Vol. III., page 727.

This was enough to start a conflict with the professedly pious, when once he gave an account of the "vision," and he was contemptuously informed, by accepted ministers, that "It was all of the Devil ; that there were no such things as visions or revelations in these days ; that all such things had ceased with the apostles, and that there never would be any more of them."

On the eve of the 21st of September, 1823, through fervent prayer, another vision was presented to Mr. Smith, and he gives it, in part, as follows : —

"After I had retired to my bed for the night, I betook myself to prayer and supplication to Almighty God for forgiveness of all my sins and follies, and also for a manifestation to me, that I might know of my state and standing before him, for I had full confidence in obtaining a divine manifestation, as I had previously had one.

"While I was thus in the act of calling upon God, I discovered a light appearing in the room, which continued to increase until the room was lighter than at noonday, when immediately a personage appeared at my bedside, standing in the air, for his feet did not touch the floor. He had on a loose robe of most exquisite whiteness. It was a whiteness beyond anything earthly I had ever seen, nor do I believe that any earthly thing could be made to appear so exceedingly white and brilliant. His hands were naked, and his arms also, a little above the wrists; so, also, were his feet naked, as were his legs, a little above the ankles. His head and neck were also bare. I could discover that he had no other clothing on but this robe, as it was open so that I could see into his bosom. Not only was his robe exceedingly white, but his whole person was glorious beyond description, and his countenance truly like lightning. The room was exceedingly light, but not so very bright as immediately around his person. When I first looked upon him I was afraid, but the fear soon left me. He called me by name, and said unto me, that he was a messenger sent from the presence of God to me, and that his name was Moroni; that God had a work for me to do, and that my name should be had

for good and evil among all nations, kindreds, and tongues; or that it should be both good and evil spoken of among all people. He said there was a book deposited, written upon gold plates, giving an account of the former inhabitants of this continent, and the source from whence they sprang. He also said that the fulness of the everlasting gospel was contained in it, as delivered by the Saviour to the ancient inhabitants. Also, that there were two stones in silver bows (and these stones, fastened to a breastplate, constituted what is called the *Urim and Thummim*), deposited with the plates, and the possession and use of these stones was what constituted seers in ancient or former times, and that God had prepared them for the purpose of translating the book.

"After telling me these things, he commenced quoting the prophecies of the Old Testament. He first quoted a part of the third chapter of Malachi, and he quoted, also, the fourth or last chapter of the same prophecy, though with a little variation from the way it reads in our Bible. Instead of quoting the first verse as it reads in our books, he quoted it thus: 'For behold, the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven, and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall burn as stubble; for they that come shall burn them, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch.' And again, he quoted the fifth verse thus: 'Behold, I will reveal unto you the priesthood, by the hand of Elijah the Prophet, before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord.' He also quoted the next verse differently: 'And he shall plant



in the hearts of the children the promises made to the fathers, and the hearts of the children shall turn to their fathers ; if it were not so, the whole earth would be utterly wasted at his coming.' In addition to these, he quoted the eleventh chapter of Isaiah, saying that it was about to be fulfilled. He quoted, also, the third chapter of Acts, twenty-second and twenty-third verses, precisely as they stand in our New Testament. He said that that prophet was Christ ; but the day had not yet come when 'they who would not hear his voice should be cut off from among the people,' but soon would come. He also quoted the second chapter of Joel, from the twenty-eighth verse to the last. He also said that this was not yet fulfilled, but was soon to be. And he further stated, the fulness of the Gentiles was soon to come in. He quoted many other passages of Scripture, and offered many explanations which cannot be mentioned here. Again, he told me that when I got those plates of which he had spoken, — for the time that they should be obtained was not then fulfilled, — I should not show them to any person ; neither the breastplate with the *Urim and Thummim* ; only to those to whom I should be commanded to show them. If I did, I should be destroyed. While he was conversing with me about the plates, the vision was opened to my mind that I could see the place where the plates were deposited, and that so clearly and distinctly that I knew the place again when I visited it." — *Times and Seasons*, Vol. III., page 729. +

The points of identity between the predictions as found in the twenty-ninth chapter of Isaiah and their

fulfilment in the revelation of the "Book of Mormon" as the "book that is sealed" of verse eleven, concerning which this angel message gave the first insight, are many and most wonderfully striking. They cannot fail to attract with deep interest any thoughtful reader.

(1.) A certain people was to be unto the Lord "as Ariel." (v. 2.) The meaning of the word "Ariel" is obscure. It is thought to be "Lion of God," or "Hearth of God." Most likely the former. Accepting that "Ariel" proper was the city or people where David dwelt, Jerusalem, then the people who were to be unto the Lord "as Ariel" were to dwell elsewhere, become great, and constitute a new "lion of God," or dwell as around "the hearth of God," meaning that they were to receive his especial care, aid, and protection. The margin reads, "Woe to Ariel, to Ariel, of the city where David dwelt!" So that we have presented in these texts what may be termed an old and a new "Ariel." A comparison between two. The reading is, "It shall be unto me *as* Ariel."

(2.) This new "Ariel" after becoming great was to be "camped against," besieged, and "forts" raised against it. It was to be "brought down" and "speak out of the ground." "Thy speech shall be low out of the dust." As one that hath a familiar spirit "out of the ground." "Thy speech shall whisper out of the dust." (v. 4.)

By reason of the great destruction which would eventually be sent upon this people, it is said their "strangers" and "terrible ones" would be like "small dust" and as "chaff that passeth away." (v. 5.) Dis-

sension, conflict, war, "thunder," "storm," "earthquake," "tempest," and the "flame of devouring fire" were to unite as the wrath of God to bring about their utter destruction. (v. 6.) Now, the only way that a people could "speak out of the ground," or "whisper out of the dust" to intelligent mortals in fulfilment of this prediction, would be that their history should be written at some period in the day of their power and prosperity, and it become lost, rest in mute silence among their former habitations or desolations, since their "terrible ones" became as the "chaff that passeth away," and be discovered and brought to light by some means or other "out of the ground," to be read by an intelligent world that knew not of them. Such a history is clearly indicated in verse 11 as the "vision of all" which was to become as the "words of a book that is sealed," and to be of special notice and importance at the time of its revealment.

Such are the claims set forth in the "Sealed Book, or Book of Mormon." There we are informed that about six hundred years before the birth of the Saviour, a colony of Jews left Jerusalem and by miraculous guidance came to this western continent, — the Americas. Here they grew up an intelligent, thrifty, and powerful people. They were highly favored of the Lord, and received commandments and revelations from him for their guidance and direction. They engaged in all the labors common to secular life. They tilled the soil, mined, manufactured, built cities, churches, temples, and finally, became a great nation and empire in the New World. But as may be observed in the

history of all nations, the elements of dismemberment and destruction were early sown in the new colony. In process of time, jealousies, division, and discords precipitated war and conflict. Great leaders marshalled their hosts for the terrible strife. Strong places of defence were prepared, and forts and towers were erected. The great nation was divided, and rushed to arms. She was lifted up in pride, and forgot her God. Her sins reached to heaven. For her transgression, her glory was to depart. The enemy camped against her "round about," and laid "siege against" her "with a mount," and at about the close of the fourth century of the Christian era, having been in existence about one thousand years, by sword, and judgment, and robbery, and the wrath of the elements, sent of God, she was "brought down," laid low with the dust, to speak forever "out of the ground," if she spoke at all, by the revelation of her history written in the day of her power, peace, and learning. The wild, heartless savage possessed himself of their lands, cities, courts, churches, homes. For long ages he has roamed sullenly over the sacred places where civilization, learning, the arts, sciences, and the true order of worship were the glory of the great nation. Yet he is a savage still. Their ancient habitations remain upon the continent. Those desirous of learning from other sources of this great nation, read the late archæological works of Catherwood and Stephens, "Ancient America," by Baldwin, and "The North Americans of Antiquity," by John T. Short, and other similar works. Read also the full account found in the "Book of Mormon."

Note further the salient points in the prediction of Isaiah concerning the revelation of the history of this lost nation : (1.) The book was to be delivered to an unlearned man. (2.) The words of the book were to be delivered to the learned man. (3.) The learned would not be able to read them. (4.) The Lord would inspire the illiterate man to read it, for he was to "confound the wisdom of the wise." (5.) The deaf were to hear the words of the book. (6.) God was to proceed to "do a marvellous work and a wonder." (7.) It was to commence at a time when the people would not believe that God could or would do anything of a miraculous nature. That he had done his work, and the canon of revelation was full. (8.) There would be no prophets or seers among the people : they would be things of the past, — all dead. (9.) It would be revealed at a time when the people would be very religious in their own way. (10.) They would preach by the precepts and doctrine of men. (11.) Many would "seek deep" to hide their council ; and say, "Who seeth us?" (12.) It was to come forth just before God should favor Israel and their land. Jacob's face would soon cease its paleness. (13.) They that murmured should learn doctrine, detect their false notions that had been inflicted upon them by false teachers, and set them in the way of the true doctrine. (14.) It would detect false spirits. They that erred therein should come to understanding. (15.) The meek should increase their joy in the Lord, and the poor among men should rejoice in the Holy One of Israel, etc.

Under these circumstances, and in fulfilment of these predictions, God was to move against the pride and haughtiness of men, and confound the wisdom of the wise and startle the world by his great wisdom, power, and inspiration; inaugurate his "marvellous work and a wonder." This he has done. Here is a brief narrative of some of the events that transpired in bringing to light the long-lost history.

After Joseph Smith, Jr., had procured the plates from which the "Book of Mormon" was translated, he transcribed a number of the characters and committed them to Martin Harris, of Palmyra, New York, with instructions that he should proceed to New York City and submit the characters to the learned linguists of that city. Harris obeyed the instructions, and waited upon Prof. Anthon and Dr. Mitchell, with the paper containing the hieroglyphics submitted to his care. The following is Mr. Harris's statement concerning his visit to these learned men:—

"I went to the city of New York and presented the characters which had been transcribed, with the translation thereof, to Prof. Anthon, a gentleman celebrated for his literary attainments. Prof. Anthon stated that the translation was correct; more so than any he had before seen translated from the Egyptian. I then showed him those that were not translated, and he said they were Egyptian, Chaldaic, Assyrian, and Arabic, and he said that they were the true characters. He gave me a certificate certifying to the people of Palmyra that they were the true characters, and that the translation of such of them as had been translated was also

correct. I took the certificate and put it into my pocket, and was just leaving the house when Mr. Anthon called me back and asked me how the young man found out there were gold plates in the place where he found them. I answered, 'that an angel of God had revealed it unto him.' He then said unto me, 'Let me see the certificate.' I accordingly took it out of my pocket and gave it to him, when he took it and tore it to pieces, saying there was no such thing now as ministering of angels, and that if I would bring the plates to him he would translate them. I informed him that a part of the plates were sealed, and that I was forbidden to bring them. He replied, 'I cannot read a sealed book.'"


This statement of Martin Harris is corroborated and confirmed by Prof. Anthon himself, notwithstanding his private opinion about the characters and his attempt to cast derision upon the claim made for the book. Said he: "Some years ago a plain, apparently simple-hearted farmer called on me with a note from Dr. Mitchell, of our city, now dead, requesting me to decipher, if possible, a paper which the farmer would hand me, and which Dr. Mitchell confessed he had been unable to understand. When I asked the person who brought it how he obtained the writing, he gave me, as far as I now recollect [note this language, 'as far as I now recollect'], the following account. A gold book consisting of a number of plates of gold fastened together in the shape of a book, by wires of the same metal, which had been dug up in the northern part of the State of New York, and along with the book an enormous pair


of gold spectacles. (*Urim and Thummim*.) These spectacles were so large that if a person attempted to look through them, his two eyes would have to be turned toward one of the glasses merely, the spectacles in question being altogether too large for the human face. Whoever examined the plates through the spectacles was enabled to not only read them, but understand their meaning. All of this knowledge, however, was confined at that time to a young man who had the trunk containing the plates and spectacles in his sole possession. He put on the spectacles, or rather looked through one of the glasses, and deciphered the characters in the book, and having committed some of them to paper, handed copies to a person outside. This paper was in fact a singular scroll. It consisted of all kinds of crooked characters, disposed in columns, and had evidently been prepared by some person who had before him at the time a book containing various alphabets, Greek and Hebrew letters, crosses and flourishes. Roman letters inverted or placed sideways, were ranged in perpendicular columns, and the whole ended in a rude delineation of a circle, divided into various compartments, decked with various strange marks, and evidently copied after the Mexican calendar given by Humboldt." (E. D. Howe's work, page 272.)

(Here is presented a *fac-simile* of the characters sent by Mr. Smith to Prof. Anthon and Dr. Mitchell by Martin Harris, the ones not translated. The ones translated were written in columns, if Anthon's statement is correct as to the character having been written in columns. (Plate 1.) These characters were photo-











No. 2.





No. 3. ,



graphed from the original document borne by Mr. Harris, at the direction of the late David Whitmer, who had in his possession, at the time, said paper. They were carefully examined and compared by the author.)

The reader will bear in mind that Prof. Anthon made his statement a number of years after he was visited by Mr. Harris. He endeavors to treat lightly and cast discredit upon the claims made concerning the revelation and translation of the book by Mr. Smith (having taken sides with the popular current, not believing in the visitation of angels), but he confesses, nevertheless, that both he and Dr. Mitchell were waited upon by Mr. Harris with a copy of the characters, and that they examined them, just as is affirmed by Mr. Harris, and as is predicted in the twenty-ninth chapter of Isaiah, and the eleventh verse, would be done, which is the main point in this investigation, and that neither of them were able to decipher them. Indeed, there is nothing in the prediction of Isaiah to indicate that the learned to whom the "words of the book" would be submitted would believe anything in the transaction, but rather the reverse.

They were real characters ; so much so that the opinion is expressed that the copyist must have had several ancient alphabets before him when the characters were made.

Now, it is universally conceded that Mr. Smith was both young and illiterate when this transaction took place. He was a poor reader of the English language, and a poorer penman. It was necessary for him to employ a scribe, who wrote as he dictated. Not, as stated

by Prof. Anthon, by "handing copies to a person outside," but the scribe wrote the words as they were pronounced by Smith, the harder ones being spelled out letter by letter. According to the prophecy, the *unlearned* man was to possess the book. To the "learned" man was to be delivered the "words of the book." The implication is all through that the illiterate man, by God's aid, would be able to translate the book, and of course would be the one to submit the characters to the learned. Mr. Smith did both. The book is here to speak for itself. It can be read. It is indeed a "marvel." All agree that Smith could not have written it. No origin has been assigned to it by its enemies that is worth considering. The old Spaulding theory advanced, — set on foot in a similar manner that the story was started that the disciples came by night and stole him away while the soldiers slept, — gulped down by some for the want of something more reasonable other than the facts, is too absurd for any candid person to believe. With the touch of truth its deformity, absurdity, and rottenness appear at once. No proper reader can indorse the Spaulding fraud, however inconsistent he may think the claim for the "Book of Mormon" may be.

How strange and marvellous all this is! Especially when we observe that the universal belief, at this time, was that revelation, immediate and direct from God, had ceased; that there could be no more visiting of angels, or the obtaining of a message from them. The description of the heavenly inhabitant who visited Mr. Smith is so exact, natural, and real, that conviction is at once forced upon the mind by the narrative. It



has all the ring and exactness of truth. A plain, straightforward narration of facts, as seen ; as truthful and real as that related as seen by Paul while on his way to Damascus.

Strange, however, as it all may seem, and is, it is in exact accord with the manner that it is predicted in the prophets that the gospel should be restored in the last days. Bring your Bible, the true guide and test in this investigation, and I will point out as strange and remarkable things in it. Look at the book of Revelation, fourth chapter and first and second verses, which reads : —

“ A door was opened in heaven: and the first voice which I heard was as it were of a trumpet talking with me; which said, Come up hither, and I will shew thee things which must be hereafter. And immediately I was in the Spirit: and, behold, a throne was set.”

This vision was given in about the year 96 of the Christian era. The angel was to show him “things which must be hereafter.”

Many things were presented to the mind of the apostle, in rapid succession, and among them was the beautifully arrayed woman of the twelfth chapter; her decline, change, and dispersion into the “wilderness,” when darkness and gloom settled down upon the great world. Men were left to grope their way without divine aid or direction; hence the reign of night that ensued, as has been shown, from the fifth to the fifteenth centuries, especially. In the fourteenth chapter there is presented a brighter day to dawn, when light would reappear; so we read : —

“And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people,

“Saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come: and worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters.

“And there followed another angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication.” — Rev. xiv. 6, 7, 8.

This Babylon “is that great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth.” (Rev. xvii. 18.) It is the woman that had the “golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication.” (Rev. xvii. 4.) Indeed, it is “MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT,” of verse 5. This Babylon is to fall to rise no more; and it is written, “Rejoice over her, thou heaven, and ye holy apostles and prophets.” (Rev. xviii. 20.) Note, that just before the downfall of Babylon, God was to send his angel from heaven, “having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people.”

This “everlasting gospel” is the grand old Jerusalem gospel that was preached by Jesus and the apostles, pure and unsullied. It was to be restored to earth by an angel just before the end of the world, or the destruction of the wicked, and in time for it to be preached to “all nations” before the second coming of the Saviour. As one of the signs of the times to precede his coming, Jesus said: —

"This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." — Matt. xxiv. 14.

It is clearly indicated from this that it was foreseen that there would be a departure from the primitive faith at some period subsequent to the death of the apostles or early Christian times, and the true gospel obscured and lost, or there would have been no announcement that God would send his angel to restore it. How perfectly this prediction accords with the narrative given of the angel's visit to Mr. Smith! He was commanded to join none of the existing sects. They were all out of the way, — wrong. "Their creeds are an abomination in my sight," said the Lord. This was the hard hit in the angel's message. Sectarians, as such, like the old Jewish Pharisees, wanted compliments from the Almighty; an indorsement of their institutions and work. The angel's announcement sent consternation and dismay into their ranks, and they armed for a conflict. But it was the dawn before the day. The time had come when there should be a shaking among the dry bones, and the creeds were to go. It is nothing new to read of some one rising up against the creeds nowadays, and denouncing them as of human origin, and false. One by one great leaders rise up and declare them to be "yokes," "man-made," what nobody believes, and a "reproach." If false, added, and leading to division and discord, then God is not the author of them, hence "abomination in his sight." The following confirms this position. At the Episcopal Convention held at New York, October the 2d and 5th,

while discussing the revision of the Creed, Rev. J. J. Vance, of Arkansas, gave expression to the following : —

“In regard to the Nicene Creed, it is not the creed of the church; it was forced upon the church by civic power. It is the Roman Creed, and it is obligatory on us just as much as the creed of the infallibility of the Pope. Not only is it true that it is not the Catholic creed, but the Church of England and the Church of America do not call it the Nicene Creed.

“No such yoke as this should be put on any church in this free country. Is the Reformation complete? Are we to follow the Church of England? Are we in this land of religious liberty to follow the mother (Roman Catholic) church?” — *Newark, New Jersey, News.* (S. H., page 680.)

Again : —

“The Rev. Dr. Henry Van Dyke asks, in the *Presbyterian*: ‘Why should we retain in our creed what none of us believe, what all our teachers of theology reject, and what serves only to bring reproach upon our doctrine among them that are without?’ ” — *S. H.*, page 649.

Philip Schaff, D. D., LL. D., in speaking concerning certain things contained in the Presbyterian Creed, says : —

“These doctrines are no longer believed by a majority of Presbyterians, nor preached by any Presbyterian minister, as far as I know. They certainly could not be preached in any pulpit without emptying the pews. . . . What cannot be preached in the church and taught in the Sunday school, ought not to be put into a Confession of Faith, and imposed as a yoke upon the conscience of ministers and elders. . . . They will in future prevent many promising students from entering the ministry, and intelligent laymen from serving as elders, so long as they are required to subscribe to that document as ‘containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures.’ ” — *Creed Revision*, page 48.

Again : —

“ We need a theology and a confession that is more human than Calvinism, more divine than Arminianism, and more Christian and catholic than either; a confession . . . that will . . . prepare the way for the great work of the future, — the reunion of Christendom in the creed of Christ.” — *Ibid.*, page 42.

Sectarians themselves being the judges, “ creeds ” are no part of Christianity, and are not believed by those professing a faith in them. They are getting to be an “ abomination ” in the sight of the people, those traditioned to believe them, because of their absurdity. Is there anything strange, then, that God, in order to lift these “ yokes ” from the people’s necks, should declare to Mr. Smith, upwards of fifty years ago, that he had no delight in them? Joseph Smith was right in his inspiration and announcement, although he had the world to combat. Those of advanced thought now support the truth of his announcement by striking at the creeds themselves. Note that nothing of worth among men, among the reformers, among those contending for progress and the right, was denounced by the angel, but the “ creeds,” that are too hard and inconsistent for the sects to believe and obey themselves.

But it is not difficult to prove them all to be wrong. We have done so in this article. The continual strife, sneering, and contention among themselves prove them to be wrong ; and the further proof, as predicted, that it would become necessary for God to send his angel to earth in order to set up the truth, shows them all to be out of the way, under the creeds, and directed by men only.

It is a fact, then, that on this side of the dark day that has intervened between us and the apostles, Christ was to send his angel to earth, and commit the "everlasting gospel," precisely as claimed by Mr. Smith was revealed to him, scoff who may. The angel announced his name, Moroni. He said, as related by Mr. Smith, "that God had a work for me to do, and that my name should be had for good and evil among all nations, kindreds, and tongues."

How prophetic! How unlikely at that time that it would ever be fulfilled! But it has come to pass. That fixes it as from God. For no man can forecast the future of his own wisdom.

It was said, "Those professors were all corrupt"; but it is not intended by this, that they were all wicked of heart and dishonest of purpose. No; their creeds had misled them, corrupted their judgments, and they were being guided by them rather than walking by the light of the word of God. Like the old Pharisees, they "encompassed sea and land to make a proselyte, and when he is made, he is twofold more the child of hell than yourselves." Why? Because he was now creed-bound, under the domination of a system invented by men, that would blind, distort, and corrupt the judgment and conscience, and lead him headlong to destruction, — following dogmatically and persistently in the way of "blind guides." Creeds lead to doubt, selfishness, infidelity, irreligion, intolerance, bigotry, disunion, pious frauds, blindness, bondage, priestcraft, and death. No wonder they are denounced as "abominations" in the sight of God. All of the advanced

thinkers, the world's benefactors, and good men and women are ready to exclaim, "Hallelujah, Amen! Let them fall, to rise no more; but we will hold on to the word of God."

Further, the angel also made mention of a book that was to be associated with the restoration of the gospel, and the setting up of the kingdom of God, just previous to the end of the world, or second coming of the Saviour.

Go with me now to the twenty-ninth chapter of the Book of Isaiah, and beginning with the ninth verse, we read:—

"Stay yourselves, and wonder; cry ye out, and cry: they are drunken, but not with wine; they stagger, but not with strong drink.

"For the Lord hath poured out upon you the spirit of deep sleep, and hath closed your eyes: the prophets and your rulers, the seers hath he covered.

"And the vision of all is become unto you as the words of a book that is sealed, which men deliver to one that is learned, saying, Read this, I pray thee: and he saith, I cannot; for it is sealed:

"And the book is delivered to him that is not learned, saying, Read this, I pray thee: and he saith, I am not learned."

Here is a book spoken of in the "Holy Bible, book divine," that is to be a most wonderful book when manifest. It is called "the vision of all." The *words* of this book were to be delivered to a learned man, with the request, "Read this, I pray thee: and he saith, I cannot; for it is sealed." With all of his professed wisdom and pride of knowing, he would not be

able to decipher its contents. To him it was to be a sealed, locked book.

But the "*book*" is delivered to him that is not learned, saying, "Read this, I pray thee: and he saith, I am not learned." Neither the learned nor the unlearned are masters of the situation here. Both are to confess their inability to read the book.

Now this event was to take place at a time when the "spirit of deep sleep" would be poured out upon men. When they would be "drunken, but not with wine; they stagger, but not with strong drink." What is the difficulty with them? Answer: they are blind and groping, and staggering their way — among the creeds of earth — in spiritual things; blinded, deceived, and tossed about by the conflicting opinions of men, — "winds of doctrine." The learning of men is all they have to guide them; and these construe the word of God to cause it to read to their own liking. It is a time when there are to be no "seers" or "prophets"; they are all done away, in the opinion of this "drunken," blind, and staggering people.

What is to be done, under the situation? Who is to read the book? These drunken and sleepy inhabitants of earth, who have no communion with God, can do nothing with it; neither the learned nor the unlearned. Nevertheless, it is to form a conspicuous part in the setting up of God's latter-day work.

"Wherefore the Lord said, Forasmuch as this people draw near me with their mouth [this staggering, drunken people], and with their lips do honor me [they are a very pious people, however, in their own estimation, — church going], but have



removed their heart far from me, and their fear toward me is taught by the precept of men [nobody believes in, or receives divine inspiration or guidance, but the things of God are thought to be pointed out by the precepts, wisdom, of men]: therefore, behold, *I will proceed to do a marvellous work among this people* [among this pious, self-wise, and drunken people, who deny revelation, and do not believe in 'prophets' or 'seers'], even a marvellous work and a wonder: for the wisdom of their wise men shall perish, and the understanding of their prudent men shall be hid." — Isa. xxix. 13, 14.

There were to be called "wise" and "prudent" men among these blind and staggering inhabitants. But God is going to do such a "marvellous work" among them that it will eclipse all of the learning and pretension of the age. He is going to cause to be read that "sealed book"; for the "deaf" are to "hear the words of the book, and the eyes of the blind (by reason of what is written in it) shall see out of obscurity and out of darkness." Out of the wilderness and darkness of "mystery, Babylon," and the conflicting creeds and doctrines of men. (v. 18.) For they "that erred in spirit shall come to understanding [those who had received a false spirit for the true], and they that murmured shall learn doctrine." (v. 24.) Those who have been led by the doctrines and precepts of men will now discover their mistake, that they have been blinded and imposed upon.

But how will God proceed to perform his "marvellous work and a wonder" among this people? He will act just like himself, and it is written, "Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets." (Amos iii. 7.) He

will do that which will confound the "wise" and the "prudent"; cause to be done that which they could not do; and how? He will take the man that is "not learned" and inspire him to read the "sealed book." This is a very important book, and contains very excellent and important things, or the Lord would not have had anything to do with it. For it was to be connected with his work in the last days. The time for its revelation is fixed. So we read:—

"Is it not yet a very little while, and Lebanon shall be turned into a fruitful field, and the fruitful field shall be esteemed as a forest? And in that day shall the deaf hear the words of the book."—Isa. xxix. 17, 18.

What day? The day that God will remove the curse from the land of Lebanon or Palestine that has been so long upon it, and restore its former fertility, the early and latter rain. That has been done, and, too, since the revelation of the "sealed book." It was to be performed in "a very little while thereafter."

Now read what a recent traveller has said about Lebanon, or the land of Palestine:—

"I arrived in Indiana a few days since, from the Eastern Continent. I stopped at Joppa nearly the whole winter. For my part, I was well pleased with the country. It is certainly a land of most wonderful fruitfulness, with a delightful climate, producing everything, if properly cultivated, and from two to three crops in a year. They have grain, fruit, and vegetables all the year round; in fact, I never was in such a country before. I have seen much good country in Europe and America, but none to compare with Palestine; its fruitfulness is uncommon, and the climate the most delightful; even in winter I did not see the least sort of frost, and vegetables of every sort were

growing in perfection in their gardens. It is a *fact* that the *rain and dew are restored*; recently, in 1853, the *former and the latter rain were restored, to the astonishment of the natives.*"

Jesus said, concerning the temple that stood upon Mt. Moriah, in his day : —

"There shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down. And they [the Jews] shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." — Luke xxi. 6, 24.

This shows that a great calamity was to befall Jerusalem and the Jews; and that it was to continue until the "times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." Which is to say, that at that time God would make a change, and favor his land and the Jews. But before all this, the "sealed book" was to be read, and in "a very little while" Lebanon, or the parched land of Palestine, was to be turned into a "fruitful field," and soon thereafter it was to be said, "Jacob [the Jews] shall not now be ashamed, neither shall his face now wax pale." (Isa. xxix. 22.)

The time is fulfilled. Palestine is reviving, budding, and blossoming, and bearing fruit in abundance; and Jacob's face is turning with smiles of rejoicing to the land of his fathers.

Moses wrote of Joseph's land and that of his posterity as follows : —

"And of Joseph he said, Blessed of the Lord be his land, for the precious things of heaven, for the dew, and for the deep that coucheth beneath,

"And for the precious fruits brought forth by the sun, and for the precious things put forth by the moon,

“And for the chief things of the ancient mountains, and for the precious things of the lasting hills,

“And for the precious things of the earth and fulness thereof, and for the good will of him that dwelt in the bush: let the blessing come upon the head of Joseph, and upon the top of the head of him that was separated from his brethren. . . . They are the ten thousands of Ephraim, and they are the thousands of Manasseh.” — Deut. xxxiii. 13-17. (See Gen. xlviii.; xlix. 22-26.)

This land of Joseph, upon which the great latter-day work was to begin, and the sealed book be brought to light, was described in vision and announced by Isaiah, as follows: “Woe to the land shadowing with wings, which is beyond the rivers of Ethiopia.” (Isa. xviii. 1.) That is, west of Northern Africa or Ethiopia, west of her rivers, and still farther west lie the Americas, stretched out amid oceans like two great wings. He goes on: —

“All ye inhabitants of the world, and dwellers on the earth, see ye, when he lifteth up an ensign on the mountains; and when he bloweth a trumpet, hear ye.” — Isa. xviii. 3.

God’s “ensign” is the gospel banner. All the world are called upon to behold when he sets it up. It was to be established as the “marvellous work and a wonder,” inaugurated by the Almighty, in sending his angel to restore the gospel just “afore the harvest” (v. 5), or end of the world.

Again Isaiah says: —

“He shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth.” — Isa. xi. 12.

This, too, was to precede the return of the Jews to their ancient home.

Mr. Smith then received the right messenger, the right message, was in the right place, lived in the right time, and made the right claim to fulfil these prophecies in the work that he did. Under the movement of this "marvellous work and a wonder," to begin previous to restoring the fertility of ancient Palestine, and also restoring the Jews to their ancient home, God was to

"Take the stick of Joseph, which is in the hand of Ephraim, and the tribes of Israel his fellows, and will put them with him, even with the stick of Judah, and make them one stick, and they shall be one in mine hand." — Ezek. xxxvii. 19.

This "stick of Joseph, which is in the hand of Ephraim," contains the things of God revealed to Ephraim, as the stick of Judah (the Bible) contains the things of God revealed to Judah. Ephraim (and Manasseh) was to dwell to "the utmost bounds of the everlasting hills," from Palestine or Egypt. (Gen. xlix. 26.) This brings us again to America, Joseph's or Ephraim's, his son's, land. Here he was to dwell, and of course here his record would be: Mr. Smith was in the right place, and proceeded in the right way in order to get it. It was to be revealed before the return of the Jews to their promised inheritance. (See Ezek. xxxvii. 20-28, inclusive; Ps. lxxxv. 8-13; Deut. xxxiii. 13-17; Gen. xlix. 22-26; xlviii. 9-20.)

It was to come out of the earth. (See Ps. lxxxv. 8-13; Isa. xxix. 4.)

The full time had come for the introduction of the dispensation of the fulness of times that is to ultimate in the return of the Saviour to the world ; hence he sent his angel to reveal the "everlasting gospel" (Rev. xiv. 6), to be preached to all nations preparatory to that event. Mr. Smith testified truly, then, when he said that God sent his angel unto him to enlighten him concerning these things. He also testified truly when he affirmed that there was committed unto him the "*Urim and Thummim*" as a means by which he might translate the "sealed book" to the confounding and bringing to naught the wisdom of the wise.

God says, "*I will proceed to do a marvellous work.*"

Hitherto people did not believe that he could work "marvellously," miraculously, any more.

But Mr. Smith might have received the visitation of angels, discovered the "sealed book" and been able to translate it, and yet not have been qualified to build up the church of God, or even to preach and administer the gospel. Hence it is necessary to carry our inquiries further, in order to determine the manner of the rise and founding of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints.

Mr. Smith proceeds with his account as follows : —

"We still continued the work of translation (the 'sealed book' by the aid of the *Urim and Thummim*) when, in the ensuing month we, on a certain day, went into the woods to pray and inquire of the Lord respecting baptism for the remission of sins, as we found mentioned in the translation of the plates. While we were thus employed, praying and

calling upon the Lord, a *messenger from heaven descended in a cloud of light*, and having *laid his hands upon us*, he ORDAINED us, saying unto us, '*Upon you, my fellow-servants*, in the name of Messiah, *I confer the priesthood of Aaron*, which holds the keys of the ministering of angels, and of the gospel of repentance, and of baptism by immersion for the remission of sin; and this shall never be taken again from the earth until the sons of Levi do offer again an offering unto the Lord in righteousness. He said the Aaronic priesthood had not the power of laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost, but that this should be conferred on us hereafter, and *he commanded us to go and be baptized*, and gave us directions that I should baptize Oliver Cowdrey, and afterwards that he should baptize me.

"Accordingly we went and were baptized; I baptized him first, and afterwards he baptized me; after which I laid my hands upon his head and ordained him to the Aaronic priesthood; afterwards he laid his hands on me and ordained me to the same priesthood, for so we were commanded.

"The messenger who visited us on this occasion, and conferred this priesthood upon us, said that his name was John, the same that is called John the Baptist in the New Testament, and that he acted under the direction of Peter, James, and John, who held the *keys of the priesthood of Melchisedec*, which *priesthood should in due time be conferred on us*, and that I should be called the first elder and he the second. It was on the 15th day of May, 1829, that we were baptized, and ordained by the hand of the messenger."

Oliver Cowdrey writes of this event as follows: "On a sudden, as from the midst of eternity, the voice of the Redeemer spake peace to us, while the veil was parted, and the angel of God came down clothed with glory, and delivered the anxiously looked for message, and the keys of the gospel of repentance. What joy! What wonder! What amazement! While the world was racked and distracted, while millions were groping, as the blind for the wall, and while all men were resting upon uncertainty, as a general mass, our eyes beheld, our ears heard. As in the blaze of day, yes, more, above the glitter of the May sunbeam, which then shed its brilliancy over the face of nature! Then his voice, though mild, pierced to the centre, and his words, 'I am thy fellow-servant,' dispelled every fear. We listened, — we gazed, — we admired! 'T was the voice of the angel from glory; 't was a message from the Most High! And as we heard we rejoiced, while his love enkindled upon our souls, and we were rapt in the vision of the Almighty! Where was room for doubt? Nowhere; uncertainty had fled, doubt had sunk, no more to rise, while fiction and deception had fled forever.

"But, dear brother, think, further think for a moment, what joy filled our hearts, and with what surprise we must have bowed (for who would not have bowed the knee for such a blessing) when we received under his hands the *holy priesthood*, as he said, 'Upon you, my fellow-servants, in the name of Messiah, I *confer this priesthood, and this authority*, which shall remain upon earth, that the sons of Levi may yet offer an offering unto the Lord in righteousness.'"



What a "marvellous work," sure enough! What a "wonder"! What a breaking away from old sectarian methods and ways! What a contrast with the church building by men, where all is assumption, human, uncertainty, and doubt! What a lesson to proud men, vain boasters and doubters, that there is a God in heaven who revealeth secrets, and that he will do his work in his own way! There is nothing new, however, in this display of light and glory as such. It is only God's way of doing. He but acted like himself; as in the days of Noah, Abraham, Moses, John the Baptist, the apostles, and Christ. While the world was being tossed about with conflicting opinions and creeds, he condescended to reveal himself by the hand of an angel of light. But there is nothing, in this great revelation, of the Congregationalist self-appointment to the ministry, and church building; nothing of the strange deflection and assumption, "*If we have authority to preach, we have authority to baptize*"; nothing of building a church on the "Bible and Bible alone"; nothing of the tame uncertainty of, "We are but a band of brethren, having a form of godliness, and seeking the power"; no transmitted authority from papal Rome, or the Roman Catholic hierarchy, or the discordant sects; nothing from old "mystery, Babylon"; nothing of a Baptist "chain," or Episcopalian "meshes" claim of a transmission: but in the quiet resort of a stately forest, — nature's solemn temple, — where purity and innocence reign complete, and naught but growing leaf and blooming flower might disturb the deep devotions and peace of prayer of men of faith,

an angel of glory, — sent by Jesus, — under the direction of Peter, James, and John, to whom was committed the keys of the kingdom of God in days of old, — in the blaze of day, — wends his way to earth, and conferred with his own pure hands and divinely uttered words the priesthood, — long since lost, taken to heaven, as represented by the man-child of Rev. xii., — and thus authorized men, once more, to preach the gospel and baptize in the name of Messiah, authoritatively, and lay the foundation of this church and kingdom of God in these last days.

John the Revelator had the right view of the matter: "I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth." That angel has come. He conferred upon these men the Aaronic priesthood. In due time the Melchisedec priesthood also was conferred, and on Tuesday, the 6th day of April, 1830, the church of Jesus Christ was regularly organized. The following is written concerning its rise: —

"The rise of the church of Jesus Christ in these last days, being one thousand eight hundred and thirty years since the coming of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ in the flesh, it being regularly organized and established agreeably to the laws of our country, by the will and commandments of God in the fourth month, and on the sixth day of the month which is called April, which commandments were given to Joseph Smith, Jr., who was *called of God and ordained an apostle* of Jesus Christ, to be the *first elder* of this church; and Oliver Cowdrey, who was also *called of God an apostle* of Jesus Christ, to be the *second elder* of this church, and ordained under his hand." — *Covenants and Commandments*, Sec. 17, Par. 1.

Further, concerning the priesthood, it is written : —

“ And also with Peter, and James, and John, whom I have sent unto you, by whom I have ordained you and confirmed you to be apostles and especial witnesses of my name, and bear the keys of your ministry; and of the same things which I revealed unto them, unto whom I have committed the keys of my kingdom, and a dispensation of the gospel for the last time; and for the fulness of times, in the which I will gather together in one all things, both which are in heaven and which are on earth.” — *Covenants and Commandments*, Sec. 26, Par. 3.

Again : —

“ And now, behold, there are others who are called to declare my gospel, both unto the Gentile and unto the Jew; yea, even twelve, and the twelve shall be my disciples, and they shall take upon them my name. . . . They are called to go into all the world to preach my gospel unto every creature, and they are they who are ordained of me to baptize in my name according to that which is written. . . . And now I speak unto the twelve. Behold my grace is sufficient for you; you must walk uprightly before me, and sin not. And behold, you are they who are ordained of me to ordain priests and teachers to declare my gospel, according to the power of the Holy Ghost which is in you, and according to the calling and gifts of God unto men; and I, Jesus Christ, your Lord and your God, have spoken it.” — *Covenants and Commandments*, Sec. 16, Par. 6.

Thus the Melchisedec and the Aaronic priesthoods were conferred on men, and they authorized to preach the gospel and baptize those who accepted Christ and his doctrine; and in process of time, the church was fully organized, by the appointment and ordination of men to the several offices of the priesthood, in harmony with the pattern given in the New Testament of the establishment of the church, by Christ and the apostles, at Jerusalem, with —

(1.) A chief apostle and high priest, with two associate counsellors.

(2.) A quorum of twelve apostles.

(3.) Seventy elders.

(4.) Elders.

(5.) Bishops.

(6.) Priests.

(7.) Teachers.

(8.) Deacons.

(9.) High priests, evangelists, and pastors, in their proper places and order.

The ministry of this church were commissioned as follows : —

“Go ye into all the world, and whatsoever place ye cannot go into, ye shall send, that the testimony may go from you into all the world, unto every creature. And as I said unto mine apostles, even so I say unto you; for you are mine apostles, even God’s high priests; ye are they whom my Father hath given me; ye are my friends; therefore, as I said unto mine apostles, I say unto you again, that every soul who believeth on your words and is baptized by water for the remission of sins, shall receive the Holy Ghost, and these signs shall follow them that believe.

“In my name they shall do many wonderful works; in my name they shall cast out devils; in my name they shall heal the sick; in my name they shall open the eyes of the blind, and unstop the ears of the deaf; and the tongue of the dumb shall speak; and if any man shall administer poison unto them, it shall not hurt them; and the poison of the serpent shall not have power to harm them. But a commandment I give unto them, that they shall not boast themselves of these things, neither speak them before the world: for these things are given unto you for your profit and for salvation.

“Verily, verily, I say unto you, they who believe not on

your words, and are not baptized in water, in my name, for the remission of their sins, that they may receive the Holy Ghost, shall be damned, and shall not come into my Father's kingdom, where my Father and I am. And this revelation unto you, and commandment, is in force from this very hour upon all the world." — *Covenants and Commandments*, Sec. 83, Pars. 10, 11, 12.

Again, to Sidney Rigdon : —

"Thou didst baptize by water unto repentance, but they received not the Holy Ghost; but now I give unto thee a commandment that thou shalt baptize by water, and they shall receive the Holy Ghost by the laying on of the hands." — *Covenants and Commandments*, Sec. 34, Par. 2.

How this rings like the old gospel of Pentecost day, when Peter said : —

"Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.

"For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." — Acts ii. 38, 39.

And the manner of Paul : —

"When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.

"And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues, and prophesied." — Acts xix. 5, 6.

And the statement of Jesus : —

"And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.

"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be damned.

“ And these signs shall follow them that believe; In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues;

“ They shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover.” — Mark xvi. 15, 16, 17, 18.

The grand old Christian test, given by Jesus, has come again, as follows : —

“ My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me.

“ If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself.” — John vii. 16, 17.

This church has thus been established by the will and commandment of God, and the administration of angels, and the gift and power of the Holy Ghost, in these last days, and its ministry has been authorized and commissioned, as the apostles and saints in days of old, to preach the gospel “to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, under the whole heaven”; and the voice of warning is to all men, Repent, repent, for the coming of the Lord is nigh, and the hour of God’s judgment is at hand! Repent, and believe the gospel. Read, test, and be convinced.

This church, in its great outlines and chief doctrines, is in harmony with God’s order of government, although in conflict with that of men. Hence, the world is moved with derision, and the devil has been enraged against it ever since its very inception, the same cause producing the same effect. From first to last, Satan has been on hand with his old tactics, scorning even-handed justice and fairness. He said of

Jesus, "He is a wine-bibber," a "glutton," a "friend of publicans and sinners"; "casts out devils by Beelzebub, the prince of devils"; an enemy of the state, a rival of Cæsar. It was said, "This sect was everywhere spoken against." Derision, vituperation, misrepresentation, slander, opprobrium, persecution, intolerance, and death were the weapons used against the truth in the time of the Saviour and the apostles, in order to blind, corrupt, and mislead the people. It was successful in controlling the masses until they nailed Jesus to the cross, slayed the apostles and thousands of the saints, who at the same time thought they were doing God's service. Jesus said, "He that is of God, heareth God's word." But that blind, professedly pious, intolerant, and ungodly mass of humanity did not want any word of God. They wanted their own way; and they "cried out all at once, saying, Away with this man, and release unto us Barabbas," the thief. Anybody but the good.

Reader, this gives you a clear insight into the methods and tactics used by the opposers of the truth, whether by vain men or devils, and you need not be blinded, decoyed, or led thereby. So that when you hear men deriding, slandering, misrepresenting, persecuting, and saying all manner of evil against the church of Jesus Christ, and the chief instruments that God used in founding it, do not be dismayed or alarmed, as though some new thing had appeared. It is the old enemy of the truth come again. His weapons are the same; he has no better to use. He dare not appeal to what is written,—the word of God,—because his is a lost

cause when he attempts that. To-day, as of old, "He that is of God, heareth God's word." "Come and let us reason together." "To the law and to the testimony : if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." (Isa. viii. 20.) "As ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." (Jesus.) God is ever the same, — true, tolerant, and considerate. Men, too, are always the same, — proud, full of malice, jealousy, revenge, and hate ; lovers of themselves more than lovers of God.

But some professedly pious person, or blind guide, exclaims, "Joseph Smith was a bad man. We have heard it."

Indeed, some one has spoken evil of all good and great men ; sometimes from a just cause, and sometimes from no incentive at all but their own innate meanness, jealousy, and superstitions. Does any one refuse to read the books of Psalms and Proverbs because David and Solomon did wicked things? or the Pentateuch, because Moses went so far astray that the Lord would not permit him to cross over Jordan into the promised land? or the New Testament, because Peter cursed and swore, and Paul and Barnabas engaged in an altercation, and the saints were "spoken against everywhere"? Do any refuse to unite with the great and powerful organizations of Protestant sects, because of what their enemies, as well as their friends, say of their leaders or chief men? or what is before all eyes, the wicked ways of many of their chief pastors?

Here is a Roman Catholic view of Protestant reformers in general : —



"How do Luther and Calvin, and Zwinglius and Knox, and Henry the Eighth, compare with these genuine and saintly reformers [Roman Catholic churchmen, popes, etc., Charles Borromeo, Bartholomew, Ignatius of Loyola, Alphonsus, and Philip Neri], both as to their moral character and the fruit of their labors? The private lives of these pseudo-reformers were stained by cruelty, rapine, and licentiousness; and as the result of their propagandism, history records civil wars, and bloodshed, and bitter religious strife, and the dismemberment of Christianity into a thousand sects." — *The Faith of our Fathers*, by CARDINAL GIBBONS, page 47.

"Luther and his colleagues, Melanchthon and Bucer, permitted Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, to have two wives at the same time.

"Karlstadt, another German reformer, justified polygamy." — *Faith of our Fathers*, page 430.

Those who are inclined to judge others by public rumor, and what their enemies say of them, rather than by a considerate and just judgment, can be profited by reading the following, as expressive of the estimate put on the Christians and the Christian religion by the popular masses and powerful organizations, at the beginning of the second century of the Christian era : —

"I never had the misfortune to be present at any examination of Christians before I came into this province. I am therefore at a loss to determine what is the usual object of inquiry or punishment, and to what length either of them is to be carried. It has also been with me a question very problematical, whether any distinction should be made between the young and the old, the tender and the robust; whether any room should be given for repentance, or the guilt of Christianity once incurred is not to be expiated by the unequivocal retraction. . . . I ask them whether they are Christians. If they plead guilty I interrogate them twice afresh, with a menace of capita

punishment. In case of obstinate perseverance, I order them to be executed. For of this I had no doubt, whatever was the nature of their religion, that a sullen and obstinate inflexibility called for the vengeance of the magistrate. Some were affected with the same madness, whom, on account of their citizenship, I reserved to be sent to Rome, to your tribunal. . . . And this was the account which they gave of the nature of their religion they once had professed, whether it deserves the name of crime or error; namely, that they were accustomed on a stated day to meet before daylight, and to repeat among themselves a hymn to Christ, as to a god. . . . After which it was their custom to separate, and meet again at a promiscuous, harmless meal. . . . I forbade any societies of that sort. . . . On which account I judged it the more necessary to inquire, by torture, from two females, who were said to be deaconesses, what is the real truth; but nothing could I collect except a *depraved and excessive* superstition. Deferring, therefore, any further investigation, I determined to consult you. For the number of culprits is so great as to call for serious consultation.

“Many persons are informed against, of every age and of both sexes; and more still will be in the same situation. The *contagion of the superstition* hath spread, not only through cities, but even villages in the country.” — *C. Pliny to Trajan, Emperor.*

“These people must not be sought after. If they are brought before you and convicted, let them be capitally punished; yet with this restriction, if any one renounce Christianity, and evidence his sincerity by supplicating our gods, however suspected he may be for the past, he shall obtain pardon for the future on his repentance.” — *The Emperor Trajan to Pliny.*

The Emperor, Antoninus Pius, wrote A. D. 140 to the Common Council of Asia: “But you harass and vex the Christians, and accuse them of atheism and other crimes, which you can by no means prove. To them it appears an advantage to die for their religion.”

“Tacitus had the common feeling about Christianity as a *destructive superstition*, and about Christians as undeserving of mercy.” — MARSH’S *Ecclesiastical History*, page 167.

Tertullian says : —

“What are we to think of it, that *most people* so blindly knock their heads against the hatred of the Christian name, that when they hear favorable testimony to any one, they mingle with it abuse of the name he bears? ‘A good man,’ says one, ‘is Caius Seius, only that he is a Christian.’ So another, ‘I am astonished that a wise man like Lucius should have become a Christian.’ ” — *Apology*, Chap. III., Vol. III., Anti-Nicene Fathers.

Again, it is said : —

“The Christians were denounced as the common enemies of mankind. The learned looked upon them with contempt as a vulgar throng of deluded enthusiasts,” etc.

Such, once, was the opinion of the great and gay world of Christianity and Christians. This should caution us not to pass upon any people or their claims hastily, but, after making diligent inquiry as to the facts of their claims, then pass a considerate and just judgment.

The common proverb, “Those who live in glass houses should not cast stones,” ought to admonish some people not to be in too much haste in scorning and condemning others, and unheard. Rant, slur, and opprobrium are no arguments for or against anything or anybody but those who deal in them.

Even of our good Mr. Wesley it is related that

“He was accused of diverting the people from labor (while laboring as a missionary at Savannah, Ga.), of fomenting divisions, of claiming high and unwarranted ecclesiastical authority. His conduct towards a niece of one of the principal settlers (a Miss Williams) was highly resented by her friends. Thirteen indictments, for alleged offences, were found against him; but

before the time of trial he returned to England (left under cover of his friends at night), and there for many years pursued a successful and distinguished career of piety and usefulness."—*History of the United States*, by WILEY, published in 1830, in New York.

With so much to admonish, and this is not a tithe that has been said, both of the great reformers and chief reformed churches, the most superstitious, illiterate, and prejudiced of persons should be moved to act upon the Christian virtues of fairness and justness toward poor Mr. Smith, and judge him according to the facts of history, as manifest in his life and work, written, not altogether by his enemies, but by his friends, also. Judge him according to the principles, doctrine, and faith which he announced. The work that he did is the only apology he needs. His whole life shone with a lustre of morality, purity, and devotion to truth equal to, not to say in advance of, the most perfect and upright of the reformers of worldly fame and honor. Let us be fair and just, then, and accept the exhortation, "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good."

Take warning, dear reader, and pursue a steady, unbiased course in the search for knowledge. It will make you free.

In confirmation of the declared purpose of the Almighty to establish a marvellous work among men, and publish the gospel to the nations just previous to the Saviour's coming, or in the last days, we cite the statements of some of the most eminent Bible students and divines of modern times.

Said Roger Williams : —

“I conceive that the apostasy of antichrist hath so far corrupted all, that there can be no recovery out of that apostasy, till Christ shall send forth new apostles to plant churches anew.”

Mr. Alexander Campbell exclaimed : —

“At evening time there shall be light. The primitive gospel, in its effulgence and power, is yet to shine out in its original splendor to regenerate the world.”

Mr. John Wesley wrote as follows : —

“The times that we have reason to believe are at hand — if they are not already begun — are what many pious men have termed the Latter-Day Glory, meaning the time wherein God would gloriously display his power and love in the fulfilment of the promise that ‘the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth, as the waters cover the sea.’ The generality of Christians can see no signs of the glorious day that is approaching; but how is this to be accounted for? How is it that men who can *now* ‘discern the face of the sky,’ who are not only great philosophers but great divines, as eminent as ever the Sadducees or Pharisees were, do not discern the signs of the glorious times, which if not begun *are nigh even at the door?*”

“And yet the wise men of the world, men of learning and renown, cannot understand what we mean by talking of an extraordinary work of God. They cannot discern the signs of the times. They see no signs at all of God’s arising to maintain his own cause, and set up his kingdom over all the earth.

“What could God have done which he hath not done to convince you that the day is coming, that the time is at hand when he will fulfil this glorious promise, and will arise to maintain his own cause, *and set up his kingdom?*” — J. WESLEY, *Sermon*, 71.

Charles Wesley wrote and sang, as if inspired with a view of the inauguration of the latter-day dispensation, as follows : —

Almighty God of love,  
 Set up the attracting sign,  
 And summon whom thou dost approve,  
 For messengers divine.

From favored Abraham's seed  
 The new apostles choose,  
 In isles and continents to spread  
 The dead-reviving news.

We know it shall be done;  
 'Tis God's almighty word;  
 All Israel shall the Saviour own,  
 To their first state restored.

Send, then, thy servants forth,  
 To call the Hebrews home;  
 From east and west, and south and north,  
 Let all the wand'ers come.

With Israel's myriads seal'd,  
 Let all the nations meet,  
 And show the mystery fulfill'd,  
 The family complete.

This is in accord with the declared statements of the prophets. Daniel says :—

“ And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever.” — Dan. ii. 44.

This was to take place after the decline and fall of the Roman Empire, and its division into ten kingdoms. The division did not occur for many centuries after the beginning of the Christian era; hence the setting up of the kingdom of God, as indicated by Daniel, was to be a latter-day event, in the day of the Lord's “preparation.”

Nahum says : —

“ The chariots shall be with flaming torches in the day of his preparation, and the fir trees shall be terribly shaken. The chariots shall rage in the streets, they shall jostle one against another in the broad ways: they shall seem like torches, they shall run like the lightnings.” — Chap. ii. 3, 4.

This clearly indicates modern improvements, and the employment of the agency of steam and electricity as a means of transportation. Who has not viewed with admiration and wonder the latter-day chariots as they “run like the lightnings,” and “jostle one against another in the broad way”? In the distance, they “seem like torches,” and the trees are “terribly shaken.” This fixes the day of God’s “preparation.”

Old Israel is to be aroused as by a new inspiration, and his face turned with smiles of hope toward the “city of the great King.” So the prophet proclaimed : —

“ Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God.

“ Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned: for she hath received of the Lord’s hand double for all her sins.”

“ Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low: and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain:

“ And the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.” — Isa. xl. 1, 2, 4, 5.

“ And they shall build the old wastes, they shall raise up the former desolations, and they shall repair the waste cities, the desolations of many generations.”

“ For your shame ye shall have double; and for confusion they shall rejoice in their portion: therefore in their land they shall possess the double: everlasting joy shall be unto them.” — Isa. lxi. 4, 7.

“Go through, go through the gates; prepare ye the way of the people; cast up, cast up the highway; gather out the stones; lift up a standard for the people.” — Isa. lxii. 10.

Again : —

“And he shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth.” — Isa. xi. 12.

This ensign is the gospel “standard,” to be unfurled upon “the land shadowing with wings” (the Americas), and “All ye inhabitants of the world, and dwellers on the earth, see ye, when he lifteth up an ensign on the mountains; and when he bloweth a trumpet, hear ye.” — (Isa. xviii. 1, 3.)

These predictions portray a great latter-day work; one in which the hand of God is to be seen moving among the nations with favor towards old Israel, and the erecting of an ensign in which all the world are interested. “Kings shall be their nursing fathers, and their queens their nursing mothers.”

The time is again fixed, by Jesus and Paul, as follows : —

“And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, *until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.*” — Luke xxi. 24.

“Have they stumbled that they should fall? God forbid: but rather through their fall salvation is come unto the Gentiles.”

“Blindness in part has happened to Israel, *until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in.*”

“And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob:

“For this is *my covenant unto them*, when I shall *take away their sins.*” — Rom. xi. 11, 25, 26, 27.



Jesus says, "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled"; Paul, "Until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in." This indicates that there would be a time when Jerusalem would cease to be trodden down, and favor and blessing should be upon it. "So all Israel shall be saved." "Ungodliness shall be turned away from Jacob." Israel shall be restored. So sang Wesley:—

"Oh, send thy servants forth,  
To call the Hebrews home!  
From east and west, and south and north,  
Let all the wand'ers come."

This is "the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." (Acts iii. 21.) Hence the revelation, and restitution of the "sealed book" of Isaiah xxix., in which is written:—

"And my words shall hiss forth unto the ends of the earth, for a standard unto my people, which are of the house of Israel." (See, also, Rev. xiv. 6, 7.)

Again:—

"O ye Gentiles, have ye remembered the Jews, mine ancient covenant people? Nay; but ye have cursed them, and have hated them, and have not sought to recover them. But behold, I will return all these things upon your own heads."—*Sealed Book*, page 105.

The great events of the last days to precede the coming of the Saviour are: First, the revelation of the "sealed book," the restoration of the gospel, and the conferring of the priesthood. Second, the removing of the

curse from the land of Palestine, and the restoration of the Jews. Third, the preaching of the gospel to the nations as a warning. It was at this time that the saying of Jesus was to be fulfilled, "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." (Matt. xxiv. 14.) Fourth, the gathering out and preparing a people to meet the Lord when he comes. Fifth, plagues to be sent upon the wicked in the form of sickness, fire, sword, flood, tempest, famine, the thunder of heaven, and fierce and vivid lightnings. Old Babylon is to be had in remembrance before God, and is to fall to rise no more. So it is written:—

"O the wise, and learned, and rich, that are puffed up in the pride of their hearts, and all those who preach false doctrines, and all those who commit whoredoms, and pervert the right way of the Lord; woe, woe, woe be unto them, saith the Lord God Almighty, for they shall be thrust down to hell.

"Woe unto them that turn aside the just for a thing of naught, and revile against that which is good, and say that it is of no worth: for the day shall come that the Lord God will speedily visit the inhabitants of the earth; and in that day that they are fully ripe in iniquity, they shall perish. But behold, if the inhabitants of the earth shall repent of their wickedness and abominations, they shall not be destroyed, saith the Lord of hosts. But behold, that great and abominable church, the whore of all the earth, must tumble to the earth; and great must be the fall thereof: for the kingdom of the devil must shake, and they which belong to it must needs be stirred up unto repentance." — *Sealed Book*, page 103.

Again, as indicating the moral condition of the world when these great events shall transpire, we read:—

“And the Gentiles are lifted up in the pride of their eyes, and have stumbled, because of the greatness of their stumbling block, that they have built up many churches; nevertheless, they put down the power and miracles of God, and preach up unto themselves their own wisdom, and their own learning, that they may get gain, and grind upon the face of the poor; and there are many churches built up which cause envyings, and strifes, and malice; and there are also secret combinations even as in times of old, according to the combinations of the devil, for he is the foundation of all these things.”—*Sealed Book*, page 98.

Again : —

“They deny the power of God the Holy One of Israel, and they say unto the people, Hearken unto us and hear ye our precept; for behold there is no God to-day, for the Lord and the Redeemer hath done his work, and he hath given his power unto men. Behold, hearken ye unto my precept. If they shall say there is a miracle wrought by the hand of the Lord, believe it not; for this day he is not a God of miracles; he hath done his work. Yea, and there shall be many which shall say, Eat, drink, and be merry, for to-morrow we die, and it shall be well with us. And there shall also be many which shall say, Eat, drink, and be merry; nevertheless, fear God. He will justify in committing a little sin. Yea, lie a little, take the advantage of one because of his words, dig a pit for thy neighbor; there is no harm in this. And do all these things, for to-morrow we die; and if it so be that we are guilty, God will beat us with a few stripes, and at last we shall be saved in the kingdom of God. Yea, and there shall be many which shall teach after this manner, false and vain and foolish doctrines, and shall be puffed up in their hearts, and shall seek deep to hide their counsels from the Lord; and their works shall be in the dark, and the blood of the saints shall cry from the ground against them. Yea, they have all gone out of the way; they have become corrupted. Because of pride, and because of false teachers and false doctrine, their churches have become cor-

rupted, and their churches are lifted up; because of pride they are puffed up. They rob the poor, because of their fine sanctuaries; they rob the poor, because of their fine clothing; and they persecute the meek and the poor in heart, because in their pride they are puffed up. They wear stiff necks and high heads; yea, and because of pride and wickedness, and abominations and whoredoms, they have all gone astray, save it be a few who are the humble followers of Christ. Nevertheless, they are led that in many instances they do err, because they are taught by the precepts of men." — *Book of Mormon*, page 102.

"And it came to pass that I saw among the nations of the Gentiles the foundation of a great church. And the angel said unto me, Behold the foundation of a church, which is most abominable above all other churches, which slayeth the saints of God; yea, and tortureth them, and bindeth them down, and yoketh them with a yoke of iron, and bringeth them down into captivity. And it came to pass that I beheld this great and abominable church; and I saw the devil that he was the foundation of it. And I also saw gold and silver, and silks, and scarlets, and fine-twined linen, and all manner of precious clothing; and I saw many harlots. And the angel spake unto me, saying, Behold the gold and the silver, and the silks, and the scarlets, and the fine-twined linen, and the precious clothing, and the harlots, are the desires of this great and abominable church; and also for the praise of the world do they destroy the saints of God, and bring them down into captivity." — *Book of Mormon*, page 23, paragraphs 33, 34.

"Thou seest the foundation of a great and abominable church, which is most abominable above all other churches." — Page 25, paragraph 40.

"And that great pit which hath been digged for them, by the great and abominable church, which was founded by the devil and his children that he might lead away the souls of men down to hell; yea, that great pit which hath been digged for the destruction of men, shall be filled by those who digged it, unto their utter destruction, saith the Lamb of God." — Page 27, paragraph 44.

“And it came to pass that I beheld that the wrath of God was poured out upon the great and abominable church, inso-much that there were wars and rumors of wars among all the nations and kindreds of the earth; and as there began to be wars and rumors of wars among all the nations which belonged to the mother of abominations, the angel spake unto me, saying, Behold, the wrath of God is upon the mother of harlots; and behold, thou seest all these things; and when the day cometh that the wrath of God is poured out upon the mother of harlots, which is the great and abominable church of all the earth, whose foundation is the devil, then at that day the work of the Father shall commence, in preparing the way for the fulfilling of his covenants, which he hath made to his people who are of the house of Israel.” — Page 28, paragraph 51.

Further concerning these times the Saviour spake : —

“And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring;

“Men’s hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth: for the powers of heaven shall be shaken.

“And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory.

“And when these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh.

“And he spake to them a parable; Behold the fig tree, and all the trees;

“When they now shoot forth, ye see and know of your own selves that summer is now nigh at hand.

“So likewise ye, when ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand.

“Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away, till all be fulfilled.” — Luke xxi. 25-32.

The generation in which the signs here indicated are to take place, was not to pass until all be fulfilled.

The great destructions and perplexities by sea and land ; the signs in the sun, moon, and stars ; the distress of nations, "with men's hearts failing them for fear" ; the restoration of the gospel, and the movement among the nations of the earth favoring the restoration of the Jews ; the especial favor of Providence upon their land ; the revelation of the "sealed book" of Isaiah xxix. ; the conferring of the priesthood, the preaching of the gospel to all the world as a witness ; the extreme recklessness, infidelity, and wickedness of the world, — are all events announced to transpire in this latter-day dispensation, to eventuate in the coming of the Saviour to reign on the earth.

To the intelligent and thoughtful Bible student, and observer of the momentous events thus transpiring in the political, religious, and social condition of the world, together with the strange calamities and unheard-of exhibitions in the physical universe and moral world, in the form of flood, and flame, and trial, with destruction on sea and land, and the depravity of man, the great movements among the kingdoms and nations of the earth, there is a significance and certainty attaching to these announcements made by the prophets, that is all-absorbing and convincing that there is a God in heaven, and that he is accomplishing his declared purposes among men, and "has arisen to maintain his own cause" ; to usher in the "Latter-Day Glory," in this the "dispensation of the fulness of times," in the which he will "restore all things" and "gather together in one, all things that are in heaven and that are in the earth," and "bring in everlasting righteousness" ; when

the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom, "under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High" (Dan. vii. 27); when the Saviour's prayer shall have been answered, "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven."

In further proof that Joseph Smith, Jr., was divinely inspired, and that God has sent his angel to restore the "everlasting gospel," in fulfilment of Rev. xiv. 6, 7, the following is submitted in evidence:—

"When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken." — Deut. xviii. 22.

This is equal to saying, that if the thing does "follow," and "come to pass," that is the thing which the Lord hath "spoken."

The angel said to Joseph Smith, Jr.:—

"The knowledge which this record [the 'Sealed Book'—'Book of Mormon'] contains will go to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people under the whole heaven." — *Voice of Warning*, page 72.

"On them (the plates) is contained the fulness of the gospel of Jesus Christ as it was given to his people on this land; and when it shall be brought forth by the power of God, it shall be carried to the Gentiles, *of whom many will receive it*. . . . And because the power of God shall be displayed, those who profess to know the truth, but walk in deceit, shall tremble with anger." — *Ibid.*, page 71.

"When they are interpreted, the Lord will give the holy priesthood to some, and they shall begin to proclaim this gospel and baptize by water, and after that they shall have power to give the Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands. Then will persecution rage more and more." — *Ibid.*, page 72.

"Your name shall be known among all nations." — *Ibid.*,

Were there ever predictions made by God, angels, or men, that came to pass more fully and truly? They were beyond human wisdom. Then these are the "things" that the "Lord hath said." After the translation of the "Sealed Book" many shall say, "A Bible! a Bible! we have got a Bible, and there cannot be any more Bible." ("Book of Mormon," page 105.)

"For after the book of which I have spoken shall come forth [the 'Sealed Book'—'Book of Mormon'], and be written unto the Gentiles, and sealed up again unto the Lord, there *shall be many which shall believe the words which are written.*" ("Book of Mormon," page 106, paragraph 11.) Could any living man have known so much by his own wisdom? It has come to pass. That fixes it as true.

Again :—

"At that day when the book shall be delivered unto the man of whom I have spoken . . . three witnesses shall behold it, by the power of God, besides him to whom the book shall be delivered, and they shall testify to the truth of the book and the things therein." — *Book of Mormon*, page 100.

Here is their testimony :—

"Be it known unto all nations, kindreds, tongues, and people, unto whom this work shall come, that we, through the grace of God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, have seen the plates which contain this record, which is a record of the people of Nephi, and also of the Lamonites, their brethren, and also of the people of Jared, who came from the tower of which hath been spoken; and we also know that they have been translated by the gift and power of God, for his voice hath declared it unto us; wherefore we know of a surety that the



work is true. And we also testify that we have seen the engravings which are upon the plates, and they have been showed unto us by the power of God, and not of man. And we declare with words of soberness, that an angel of God came down from heaven, and he brought and laid before our eyes, that we beheld and saw the plates and the engravings thereon; and we know that it is by the grace of God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, that we beheld and bear record that these things are true; and it is marvellous in our eyes; nevertheless, the voice of the Lord commanded that we should bear record of it; wherefore to be obedient unto the commandments of God, we bear testimony of these things. And we know that if we are faithful in Christ, we shall rid our garments of the blood of all men, and be found spotless before the judgment seat of Christ, and shall dwell with him eternally in the heavens. And the honor be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost; which is one God. Amen.

“OLIVER COWDREY.  
DAVID WHITMER.  
MARTIN HARRIS.”

These witnesses were none of them known to Joseph Smith, Jr., at the time the “Book of Mormon” was revealed, except, possibly, he knew of Harris; hence there was no chance for collusion or fraud. The statement in the book was as literally fulfilled as any announcement could have been. The integrity of those men is known and admitted. They were faithful to their testimony before friends and foes, until death. Their names are unsullied with the odium of Salt Lake and polygamy, having denounced the intrigue and wickedness of that people, as being not of the faith. They went out from us, not “being of us.”

The angel further declared that in that “Sealed Book” was “contained the fulness of the gospel of

Jesus Christ as it was given to his people on this land, and when it shall be brought forth by the power of God it shall be carried to the Gentiles, of whom many will receive it." How could Mr. Smith of himself have known that anybody would receive it? But they did receive it, and are receiving it.

Again, says the angel, "I give unto you another sign; and when it comes to pass, then know that the Lord is God, and that he will fulfil his purposes, and that the knowledge which this contains [the 'sealed book' of Isaiah xxix.] will go to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people under the whole heaven." Could Mr. Smith of himself have divined this? Yet it has nearly or quite come to pass.

But the angel continues:—

"This is the sign: When these things begin to be known, that is, when it is known that the Lord has shown you these things, the workers of iniquity will seek your overthrow. They will circulate falsehoods to destroy your reputation, and also will seek to take your life; but remember this, if you are faithful, and shall hereafter continue to keep the commandments of the Lord, you shall be preserved to bring these things forth."

Was there ever a thing declared that was more faithfully true?

Again, it is written:—

"And the blood of the saints shall cry from the ground against them." — *Scaled Book*, page 103.

Who could have forecast, but the all-wise God, that in this land of liberty, sanctified by the blood of our Revolutionary fathers, where the equal rights of men

and freedom of worship are the pride and boast of the people, and which are guaranteed by constitutional enactment, where the grand old stars and stripes waved in heaven as security of those rights, that men, women, and children would be shot down in cold blood, and otherwise maltreated and killed, just because they differed from their neighbors in religious belief? Let the history of the States of Illinois and Missouri attest the divinity in the above statement. In Illinois, Joseph Smith and his brother Hiram were shot dead because of their religious beliefs, and their blood still stains the floor of the old prison at Carthage. In Missouri seventeen innocent people were shot on account of their faith and thrown into one well as a burying place, and numbers of others killed, whipped, robbed, and upwards of three thousand souls expelled from the State, in the dead of winter, under the exterminating order of the governor, and not a single indictment against them on the records indicating wrong-doing upon their part. It is preposterous to assume that Joseph Smith could have divined by his own wisdom that these terrible, atrocious, and reproachful deeds should have been perpetrated in free America.

When a man speaks in the name of the Lord, and it follows, — comes to pass, — that is the thing the Lord has said.

In 1831 the Lord said unto Joseph Smith : —

“ Verily I say unto you, that great things await you; ye hear of wars in foreign lands, but behold I say unto you, they are nigh, even at your doors, and not many years hence ye shall hear of wars in your own lands.” — *Covenants and Commandments*, Sect. 45, paragraph 11.

Again : —

“The judgments of God are almost ready to burst upon the nations of the earth. . . . And now I am prepared to say by the authority of Jesus Christ that not many years shall pass away before the United States shall present such a scene of bloodshed as has not a parallel in the history of our nation.”  
— *Letter of Joseph Smith to N. Seaton, of New York, Jan. 5, 1833.*

“Verily, thus saith the Lord concerning the wars that will shortly come to pass, beginning at the rebellion of South Carolina, which will eventually terminate in the death and misery of many souls. The days will come that war will be poured out upon all nations beginning at that place, for behold the Southern States shall be divided against the Northern States, and the Southern States will call on other nations, even the nation of Great Britain, as it is called, and they shall also call upon other nations in order to defend themselves against other nations, and thus shall war be poured out upon all nations. And it shall come to pass after many days, slaves shall rise up against their masters, who shall be marshalled and disciplined for war. And it shall come to pass, also, that the remnants who are left of the land shall marshal themselves and shall become exceeding angry, and shall vex the Gentiles with a sore vexation; and thus with the sword and by bloodshed the inhabitants of the earth shall mourn, and with famine, and plague, and earthquakes, and the thunder of heaven, and the fierce and vivid lightnings also, shall the inhabitants of the earth be made to feel the wrath and indignation and chastening hand of an Almighty God until the consumption decreed hath made a full end of all nations, that the cry of the saints and the blood of the saints shall cease to come up into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth from the earth, to be avenged of their enemies. Wherefore stand ye in holy places, and be not moved until the day of the Lord come; for behold it cometh quickly, saith the Lord. Amen.”

Is not the great Rebellion of 1860 a sufficient attestation that these utterances were inspired of God? Men

could not have given such a forecast of the future. When the thing follows and comes to pass, of such an extraordinary character, it is God that speaks. Revelation given in 1832. Published in the *Pearl of Great Price*, in 1851, at Liverpool, Eng.

Again : —

“The angel said to Mr. Smith, ‘Your name shall be known among the nations; for the work which the Lord will perform by your hands shall cause the righteous to rejoice and the wicked to rage.’” — *Voice of Warning*, page 72.

It is predicted in the “Sealed Book” that it would be brought to light : —

“In a day when the blood of the saints will cry unto the Lord, because of secret combinations and the works of darkness; yea, it shall come in a day when the power of God shall be denied, and churches become defiled, and shall be lifted up in the pride of their hearts; . . . It shall come in a day when there shall be great pollutions upon the face of the earth; there shall be murders, and robbing, and lying, and deceivings, and whoredoms, and all manner of abominations, when there shall be many who will say, ‘Do this or do that,’ and it matters not, for the Lord will uphold such at the last day. . . .

“Behold, Jesus Christ has shown you unto me, and I know your doings; and I know that you do walk in the pride of your hearts; and there are none, save a few only, who do not lift themselves up in the pride of their hearts, unto the wearing of very fine apparel, unto envying, and strifes, and malice, and persecutions, and all manner of iniquities; and your churches, yea, even every one, have become polluted because of the pride of your hearts. For behold, ye do love money, and your substances, and your fine apparel, and the adorning of your churches, more than ye love the poor and the needy, the sick and the afflicted.” — Pages 496, 497.

None can deny that the things set forth in the above have been increased in a surprising manner since the revelation of the “Sealed Book.” So that the prevailing influence of such things in society, and throughout Christendom, support the position that these utterances were divinely inspired.

## CHAPTER XI.

MODERN SCIENTIFIC DISCLOSURES CORROBORATE THE STATEMENTS OF JOSEPH SMITH, JR., THAT THE CHARACTERS SUBMITTED BY HIM AND MARTIN HARRIS TO THE INSPECTION OF DR. MITCHELL AND PROF. ANTHON, OF NEW YORK CITY, WERE TRUE ONES, AND WERE COPIED FROM THE RECORDS OF THE ANCIENT INHABITANTS OF AMERICA, AS AFFIRMED AND TESTIFIED TO BY HIM AND OTHERS.

PROF. ANTHON, no doubt, intended that his statement concerning the characters submitted to him should militate against the claims of the "Book of Mormon." Said he, "This paper was in fact a singular scroll. It consisted of all kinds of crooked characters, disposed in columns. . . . Greek and Hebrew letters, crosses and flourishes, Roman letters inverted or placed sideways, were arranged in perpendicular columns, and the whole ended in the rude delineation of a circle, divided into various compartments, decked with various strange marks."

Mr. Harris says that Prof. Anthon "said they were Egyptian, Chaldaic, Assyrian, and Arabic characters." (See page 202.)

Let us examine these statements, especially that of Prof. Anthon, in the light of the statements made in the "Book of Mormon," compared with modern scientific discoveries, and judge as to whether it is safe to lightly treat Smith's claim to having obtained plates and translated them, or not.

The "Book of Mormon" asserts that a colony of people came from the tower of Babel, crossed the ocean, and settled in Central America. They were called Jaredites. This migration from the Old World took place upwards of two thousand years previous to the birth of the Saviour. From Central America they spread into North America, but they never inhabited South America.

A second colony, called Nephites (of whom the "Book of Mormon" is mainly an abridged history), left Jerusalem under divine guidance, in the days of "Zedekiah, king of Judah," about six hundred years before Christ, and finally landed upon the west coast of South America, not far from the territory now known as Chili or Peru. They were Jews, and possessed a knowledge of the "learning of the Jews, and the language of the Egyptians."

They brought with them a copy of the Hebrew Scriptures, extending down to the days of Jeremiah the prophet, and they wrote a history of themselves (engraved it upon metallic plates), in what they called the "Reformed Egyptian language."

Still a third colony came out from Jerusalem at the time that Zedekiah, king of Judah, was carried away captive to Babylon, one of Zedekiah's sons, named Mulek, being among the number. They also settled in the country now known as Eastern Central America. In process of time they changed their language, or rather, it "became corrupted." ("Book of Mormon," pages 1, 3, 9, 43, 95, 137, 394, 500, and 510.)

The Nephites also changed their language, both the

"Hebrew" and the "Reformed Egyptian," to suit their time and circumstances. (Page 500.)

These two latter nations were finally united into one nation. One king reigned over them, and they grew and spread into South, Central, and North America, from sea to sea, east and west. They reinhabited Central and North America, where the Jaredites, who came out from Babel twelve centuries before the Nephite colony arrived from Jerusalem, had dwelt, and became a great nation, the Jaredite colony now having become extinct.

Accepting all this as true, together with the statement that these distinct peoples possessed a written language, two of whom at least were educated Jews, of one it is expressly stated that he possessed a knowledge of the "learning of the Jews, and the language of the Egyptians"; and another colony, that they came from the tower, at the confusion of tongues, bringing with them the old prehistoric Cushite, Arabic, and Chaldaic language (for their language was not confounded), and there is nothing in the statement of Prof. Anthon, in his description of the characters taken from their records, which represented their manner of writing, as averred by Mr. Smith and others, that is so wonderfully inconsistent with what might logically be expected. They consisted of "all kinds of crooked characters," a "singular scroll," "Greek and Hebrew letters," "crosses and flourishes," "Roman letters inverted," and "ranged in perpendicular columns." Mr. Harris says they were declared to be "Egyptian, Chaldaic, Assyrian, and Arabic characters."



From a consideration of the history of those peoples, as given in the "Book of Mormon," it would be reasonable to conclude that their writings would appear very much as set out by Prof. Anthon. It is now known that in primeval times, Egypt, Chaldea, Ionia (Asia Minor), and Canaan were settled by emigrants from Arabia, which belonged to the old Cushite or Hamite nation, both of these being of the same, or similar, national habits and culture. They were the civilizers and educators of their time. Their attainments were simply marvellous, especially in the science of mathematics and astronomy. From their old alphabet it is alleged were derived all the alphabets of modern Europe, and it was out from that people that the first colonies came to this western continent. Says John D. Baldwin, A. M. : —

"What is usually talked of as Greek culture had its origin in Asia Minor, and was richly developed there long before its light appeared at Athens. The earliest intellectual movement that found expression in the Greek language was wholly Asiatic. It appeared in Ionia, the country of Homer, Thales, Pythagoras, and Herodotus, where, during many ages before the Ionians and their language became predominant, another people had richly brightened the land with their culture. The literature, language, and sway of the older people were superseded or absorbed by the Ionic family of the Greek race, just as in Italy, some centuries later, the speech, culture, and dominion of Etruria were superseded by the Romans. The cities of Ionia and of the whole coast of Asia Minor were built and occupied originally by the race represented by the Phœnicians, followed by the Pelasgians; and in that beautiful region, whatever culture was known to Arabia, Egypt, Chaldea, and the East, received its most elegant development.

"The scholars of Ionia itself studied in the schools of Phœnicia and Egypt. They reached a degree of intellectual independence and of progress in science never equalled by any community on the other side of the Ægean.

"Only a small portion of the literature of Ionia has been preserved; but the earliest Greek writers known or mentioned were all natives of Asia Minor, or representatives of its culture. Homer was born and educated there; Hesiod's parentage and literary training were both Ionian; Archilochus, 'the first Greek who composed iambic verses according to fixed rules,' was born on that coast in the eighth century before Christ, and had a fame 'second only to that of Homer.' There appeared the first development of what has been called the 'Greek philosophy,' and Herodotus tells us that Thales, 'the father of Greek philosophy,' was 'of Phœnician extraction'; he was born at Miletus in the seventh century before Christ. . . . In Asia Minor rose the most elegant and beautiful order of Greek architecture — the Ionic.

"At the beginning of the sixth century before Christ the Greek world had two matchless temples that moved all beholders with admiration and wonder. They were both in Asia Minor, one being the temple of Hera, at Samos, the other the temple of Diana, at Ephesus. Artistic architecture had not then made its appearance in Hellas. . . . Herodotus showed that religion, letters, and civilization came to the Greeks from the Phœnicians and Egyptians." — *Prehistoric Nations*, pages 43-45.

Here we have presented a remarkable civilization that existed in primeval times, which antedates the civilization of Greece, or Rome, or Phœnicia. Its original seat was in old Arabia; from thence the inhabitants emigrated westward and laid the foundations of Egypt, Chaldea, Mesopotamia, indeed all Western Asia, Canaan, and Phœnicia. They had "reached a degree of intellectual independence and progress in science never

equalled by any community on the other side of the *Ægean*." From their alphabet, "all of the alphabets of modern Europe have been derived." This discovery is indeed a strange kind of missing link, that scientists have luckily run on to, in these modern times. What a contrast it is from our former notions of what these ancient people were! These late discoveries reveal the fact that away back in those primeval times there dwelt a large, enterprising, and flourishing nationality, not of ignorance and heathenish darkness, as had been supposed, but of civilization and culture. Greece and Rome were not the originators of civilization, the arts and sciences, the places where they grew up spontaneously like weeds from the field, then, as has been hitherto taught and believed; but what they possessed in the way of learning, in the arts and sciences, was borrowed from an older and higher civilization, one which they never equalled in intellectual and scientific attainments.

It will pay, then, to retrace our steps and come back to the old stable Bible ground: that language, civilization, and culture began at Eden, and were transmitted across the flood in the family of Noah, and thence to his descendants, rather than having been evolved with the evolution of man from protoplasm, and through the monkey in his various changes and links, as held by some.

In the "Book of Mormon" we are informed that upwards of twenty centuries before the birth of the Saviour (at the fall of Babel and the confusion of tongues) there came a colony out from this old Cushite

civilization, under divine guidance, to the land of America. They were called Jaredites, and they brought with them the civilization, the arts, sciences, habits, customs, traditions, and language of their day and time. The Bible account is : —

“The Lord did there confound the language of all the earth: and from thence did the Lord scatter them abroad upon the face of all the earth.” — Gen. xi. 9.

The “Book of Mormon” affirms that a colony came directly from the tower to this Western Continent, and the Bible says God “scattered them abroad upon the face of all the earth.” So the two books are in accord. The people of this old colony brought with them the language of their fathers (for their speech was not confounded), containing Egyptian, Chaldaic, Arabic, Assyriac, and Ionic letters, the old alphabet from which “all the alphabets of modern Europe have been derived.”

Some twelve centuries later than the migration of the Jaredites a colony of Jews left Jerusalem, and in process of time they, also, landed in America. They understood the Hebrew language and that of the Egyptians: the latter being the old Cushite tongue, containing whatever of change that time and circumstances had caused to be made in it (including that of miracle at the confusion of tongues), and they made this language the current language of their nation and people. They called it the “Reformed Egyptian.” In after years the Nephites came in possession of the written language of the Jaredites, the records of the Jaredites

falling into their hands. One of these nations having spoken the old Cushite tongue, pure and simple, only as changed by time and circumstances, and the other, that of the Hebrew and the old Cushite tongue "reformed." It would be natural for them to retain characters from both of these languages, and combine and perpetuate them in the common language of the nation. Is there anything surprising, then, in the discovery of the records of these peoples, that they should be found to contain Hebrew, Greek, Chaldaic, Egyptian, and Arabic characters? Would it not be more surprising if they were not found? Smith was right, then, in his announcement that he had discovered and had in his possession the true characters used in writing by those prehistoric nations, and Anthon's statement confirms that of Smith, as do also the historical facts cited.

Says Josiah Priest : —

"Hebrew words are found among the American Indians in considerable variety. They are of Jewish origin."

So also declares the "Book of Mormon."

Again, says Mr. Baldwin : —

"It seems to me impossible for any free-minded scholar to study the traditions, mythologies, fragmentary records, mouldering monuments, and other remains of prehistoric ages, and fail to see that the people described in the Hebrew Scriptures as Cushites were the original civilizers of Southwestern Asia; and that, in the deepest antiquity, their influence was established in nearly all the coast regions, from the extreme east to the extreme west of the Old World." — *Prehistoric Nations*, page 18.

"In some respects, the most important discovery made in Arabia is that which brings to light the old language of the

country, and shows its affinity with that of Egypt and of Western Asia in the earliest times. In these studies nothing is more reliable than the historical revelations of the science of language.

“It is now beyond question that this Cushite tongue, found in the Chaldean ruins, and traced throughout Western Asia, was the ancient language of Arabia.” — *Ibid.*, pages 88, 89.

“The oldest Cushite alphabet known to us is that which the Phœnicians carried to Southern and Western Europe, which, however, was not preserved without modification. The names of its letters, and some of their forms, show that it was derived originally from hieroglyphics. Aleph means an ox; bit, bith, or beth, a house or temple; and gamel or gimel, a camel. . . . The invention of this alphabet, from which all the alphabets of modern Europe have been derived, was attributed to the Phœnicians. . . . The original country of the Cushite race, to which the Phœnicians belonged, — the original home where this culture had birth, and from which the Cushite colonies and influence went forth in every direction to spread civilization, and create such nations as Egypt and Chaldea, — was not merely the little district of Phœnicia; it was the whole Arabian peninsula.” — *Ibid.*, page 94.

Again : —

“The Cushite origin of the Phœnicians is shown no less distinctly by the architectural remains of their oldest cities. In every country and on every shore where the old Cushite settlements are traced, are found the remains of vast constructions that astonish and perplex beholders. They are found in Egypt, Nubia, Arabia, India, Greece, Italy, Great Britain, and Phœnicia. In Chaldea, where there was no stone, there were immense structures of brick.

“According to the uniform and explicit testimony of Greek and Roman antiquity, the art of alphabetical writing was brought into existence, or first diffused, by the Phœnicians. This art was evidently originated by the Arabian Cushites, in ages older than Egypt and Chaldea.” — *Ibid.*, pages 141, 167.

In speaking of the settlement of America in pre-historic times, Mr. Baldwin further says : —

“ If, as seems probable, this knowledge was a reality, the people who communicated with America must have gone from the great nation created on the Western Mediterranean by the earliest Cushite communities established in that region.” — *Ibid.*, page 397.

It should be borne in mind that this is the precise point which the “Book of Mormon” states the ancient inhabitants of America came from, some twenty-two centuries before Christ. The same country and the same people to which Mr. Baldwin refers.

Again : —

“ Everything points to the conclusion that the most ancient inhabitants of America were little inferior in antiquity to the earlier inhabitants of the Old World.” — *Prehistoric America*, by NADAILLAC, page 506.

Here the veil has been pushed back by modern research beyond the time of Moses, or Abraham, or Homer, or Hesiod, or Babel, when “the whole earth was of one language, and of one speech.” (Gen. xi. 1.) And the world is found to have been populated with a civilized, progressive, intelligent, and cultured race of people. Their architectural remains and immense superstructures “astonish all beholders.” They dot the world wherever this people colonized or dwelt. In Arabia, Chaldea, Egypt, Mesopotamia, Ionia, Canaan, Greece, Rome, Phœnicia, and in Central and North America their footprints are the same; stupendous buildings, marvellous superstructures, that

strike with awe and astonishment all who make their history a study. The same people who built in Egypt, Chaldea, Ionia, and Babel, built in America, and before the people from whom the Indians descended came here, as is affirmed in the "Book of Mormon." This is confirmed by the Indian himself. Says J. W. Foster, LL. D. : —

"Whilst the Indians are notoriously superstitious, and invent legends which they attach to every unusual aspect of nature, with regard to the origin of the mounds their statements are uniform, that their antiquity reaches back to a period beyond the memory of their ancestors, who saw them as they see them, reposing in an unbroken solitude, and shaded by an apparently primeval forest." — *Prehistoric Races in the United States*, page 375.

The "Book of Mormon" account reads as follows : —

"The king said unto him, Being grieved for the afflictions of my people, I caused that forty and three of my people should take a journey into the wilderness [in South America], that thereby they might find the land of Zarahemla; that we might appeal unto our brethren to deliver us out of bondage. And they were lost in the wilderness for the space of many days, yet they were diligent, and found not the land of Zarahemla, but returned to this land, having travelled in a land among many waters; having discovered a land which was covered with bones of men, and of beasts, etc., and was also covered with ruins of buildings of every kind; having discovered a land which had been peopled with a people who were as numerous as the hosts of Israel. And for a testimony that the things that they have said are true, they have brought twenty-four plates, which are filled with engravings; and they are of pure gold. And behold, also, they have brought breastplates, which are large; and they are of brass, and of copper, and are perfectly sound. And again, they have brought swords, and the



hilts thereof and the blades thereof are cankered with rust; and there is no one in the land that is able to interpret the language or the engravings that are on the plates." — *Book of Mormon*, pages 158, 159.

This history is in harmony with the Indian tradition; that is, a "uniform statement" among them everywhere, that the mound-builders preceded their nation in settling in America. The mound-builders were here centuries — twelve centuries — before the progenitors of the Indians came, according to the "*Book of Mormon*," and this king who sent out forty men in search of friends, was an ancestor of the Indian race. The "*Book of Mormon*" and other reliable history agree.

The old Cushite people that came from Babel became divided as a nation, warred among themselves, about the time that the colony of Jews, the ancestors of the Indians, left Jerusalem in the days of Zedekiah, king of Judah, and they became exterminated. Nothing was left but their monuments, mounds, and mammoth superstructures, built ages before, that the Indian knows nothing more of than the white man. The colony from Jerusalem finally possessed their history, however, learned of their origin and great calamity, and reinhabited their deserted lands, which they called "desolation," the account of which is found in the "*Book of Mormon*." Now, could Mr. Smith have guessed all this out, and have it accord with the facts and particulars of later revealments, — conjured it out of his own head? It is easier to believe in miracles than to believe that he could have done so. There is something, then, to support the claims of the "*Book of Mormon*."

Further, it is known that the oldest nation that inhabited America has long since been exterminated. So says the "Book of Mormon." So says tradition. So says modern research. The evidences point out the fact that it was sudden and complete. People left their daily pursuits, as did the people of Pompeii and Herculaneum at the time of the great eruption of Vesuvius, as if made aware that some awful impending doom awaited them; they quit their mining camps with the coveted ore partially and altogether out of the earth, which was of immense value, and never returned to claim it. They may have left it with some hope of returning, but went down to death before the power of the enemy. So the great nation became extinct. God's ways are not as man's ways. This utter destruction was presaged long before it came to pass, by the Prophet Jeremiah, as follows:—

"Flee, get you far off [Hebrew, flit greatly], dwell deep [that is, go in secret], O ye inhabitants of Hazor, saith the Lord; for Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon hath taken counsel against you, and hath conceived a purpose against you. Arise, get you up unto the wealthy nation, that dwelleth without care, saith the Lord, which have neither gates nor bars, which dwell alone. And their camels shall be a booty, and the multitude of their cattle a spoil: and I will scatter into all winds them that are in the utmost corners; and I will bring their calamity from all sides thereof, saith the Lord."—Jer. xlix. 30-32.

Nebuchadrezzar had decreed war and destruction against Jerusalem and the Jews, and the nations round about. Hazor was the old capital of the land, and the prophet uses this name instead of Jerusalem in deliv-

ering this warning to certain of the inhabitants to "Flee, get you far off, dwell deep," "get you up unto the wealthy nation, that dwelleth without care," and "I will bring their calamity from all sides." There was no nation in the Eastern world that dwelt without care or fear from other nations, that had neither bars nor gates. It is said concerning the sway of the kingdom of Babylon, "And wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field and the fowls of the heaven hath he given into thine hand, and hath made thee ruler over them all. Thou art this head of gold." (Dan. ii. 38.) There were no inhabitants in the Eastern world who did not serve the powerful kingdoms of Babylon, Medo-Persia, Macedonia, etc. We must look elsewhere for one that dwells alone and without care.

The "Book of Mormon" affirms that about the time that the king of Babylon laid siege against Jerusalem, that the Lord led a few families of Jews to the continent of America. Here they settled, and here they found that a great and powerful nation had preceded them, and for some unknown cause to them had been utterly destroyed. Nothing was left as memorials but the work of by-gone ages. Their mounds, pyramids, dwelling-places, implements of agriculture and war testified of their greatness. They had neither "bars nor gates," but dwelt "alone." The Indian is right, then, when he says the mounds were here when his ancestors came, the "Book of Mormon," the Bible, and historical facts being in evidence.

The old Cushite and Semitic peoples were necessarily the early descendants of the patriarch Noah. Near

relatives, or the immediate offspring of Shem, Ham, and Japheth first located away back in old Arabia, thence around the Persian Gulf, and finally settled in Chaldea, Egypt, Canaan, Mesopotamia, and Ionia, or Western Asia. They carried with them the language, civilization, traditions, and scientific and architectural knowledge that they had attained. On this point says Cunningham Geikie, D. D. : —

“The plains of Lower Mesopotamia had long been the seat of an ancient people when the forefathers of Abraham wandered towards them from the south, that is, from Arabia. Known to us as Accadians, and doubtless connected with the Accad mentioned in Genesis (x. 10), they had literature and a high civilization peculiar to themselves. Columns of Accadian, or early Chaldaic, as it is sometimes called, are found accompanied, side by side, by Assyrian words to explain them, as already obsolete. . . . So strangely remote, however, was the rise of this civilization, that all the great temple structures of Babylonia were founded by kings who must have reigned earlier than the sixteenth century before Christ. . . . Nor was their empire famous only for architecture. The Accadians had already distinguished themselves by careful astronomical observations and calculations; had a careful graded system of weights and measures; a money system skilfully settled; and a literature of which copious remains are now found in European museums, embracing works on geography, astrology, mythology, grammar, and mathematics. . . . On this busy scene of the very dawn of time, a new people after a while appeared, wandering from Arabia to the south of Babylonia, and settling first in and around Ur, the present Mugheir, in the delta of the Euphrates. This was the race from a branch of which Abraham was, hereafter, to spring, for they were of Semitic stock. Steadily fighting their way north, they slowly mastered the Accadians, and became their rulers.” — *Hours with the Bible*, pages 25, 26, 27.

Again : —

“ The perfection to which the art of writing had arrived so soon after Nimrod may well lead us to believe it was an art transmitted from across the waters of the deluge. The old Accadian account of the creation, so strangely recovered, is intensely interesting, at once for comparison and contrast with that of Genesis. Only two tablets out of at least five have as yet been found.” — *Ibid.*, page 29.

Dr. Geikie gives the translation of these tablets, compares them with the first chapters of Genesis concerning the creation, and concludes his comments as follows : —

“ The story of Genesis thus existed before Moses, in its completeness, both as a whole and in detail, and even in the order of its incidents.” — *Ibid.*, page 36.

This account is in harmony with the claims of the “ Book of Mormon,” that there was a civilized and cultured race of people that dwelt upon the plains of Shinar at the time of the building of Babel and the confusion of tongues, who possessed a knowledge of the creation, Noah, and the flood. The “ Book of Mormon ” also affirms that it was from this place and from among the people dwelling there that a colony emigrated at the confusion of tongues; and found a home upon this Western Continent in Central America. They represented all of culture, tradition, and written history known to this old civilization, possessing a knowledge of letters, the arts and sciences, Noah, the flood, and the creation, with the methods of building the marvelous superstructures erected by that people, having even seen the tower of Babel itself.

This position is supported by the scientific findings made in Central America, revealing traditions of Noah, the flood, the ark, and the creation of the world, together with stupendous superstructures of various kinds, and great pyramids that rival any found in the Old World, and abundant evidence of various kinds, showing that at one time there existed in that country an intelligent and powerful nation of people. The evidence goes to show that they must have been of the old Cushite and Semitic race and culture that built Arabia, Egypt, Chaldea, Western Asia, Greece, Rome, and Canaan, thus confirming what was announced in the "Book of Mormon," long before these scientific discoveries were made. This is further corroborative proof that Smith's claim to having had in his possession genuine characters of a prehistoric people who inhabited America was correct. But the evidence accumulates.

Continues Mr. Baldwin: —

"To find the chief seats and most abundant remains of the most remarkable civilization of this old American race, we must go still farther south into Central America and some of the more southern states of Mexico. Here ruins of many ancient cities have been discovered, cities which must have been deserted and left to decay in ages previous to the beginning of the Aztec supremacy. Most of these ruins were found buried in dense forests, where, at the time of the Spanish conquest, they had been long hidden from observation.

"The chief peculiarity of these ruins, that which especially invites attention, is the evidence they furnish that their builders had remarkable skill in architecture and architectural ornamentation. All who have visited them bear witness that the workmanship was of a high order. The rooms and corri-

dors in these edifices were finely and often elaborately finished, plaster, stucco, and sculpture being used. Throughout," he again says (quoting Stephens), "the laying and polishing of the stones are as perfect as under the rules of the best modern masonry. . . . The ornamentation is no less remarkable than the masonry and architectural finish." — *Ancient America*, pages 93 and 99.

This defeats the old position that the prehistoric nations that inhabited America were savages or but semi-civilized, that was current in the world at the time of the publication of the "Book of Mormon," and supports the historical account found in the "Book of Mormon," that they were an enlightened, cultured, and enterprising race of people, and this information was obtained from the characters in Smith's possession.

The Marquis de Nadaillac, author of "Prehistoric America," in writing of the old civilization of Peru, says : —

"Nowhere in the world, perhaps, has man displayed greater energy. It was in these desolate regions that arose the most powerful and most highly civilized empire of the two Americas, and at the present day its memory is everywhere preserved in the imposing ruins covering the country, the fortresses defending it, the roads intersecting it, the *acquiás*, or canals, conducting the water needed for fertilizing the fields, the *tambos* or houses of refuge, in the mountains for the use of travellers, the potteries, the linen and cotton cloth, and the ornaments of gold and silver concealed in the groves, and which are sought for by the Tapadas with insatiable zeal.

"The empire of the Incas, of which we are now to speak, was three thousand miles in length by four hundred in width. . . . It included within its limits Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador, part of Chili, and the Argentine Republic." — *Prehistoric America*, page 388.

Keeping in mind that this was the identical region that the "Book of Mormon" affirms that the intelligent and refined colony of Jews settled some six hundred years before Christ, and introduced all of science, and art, and enterprise peculiar to the Jews, Egyptians, and other kindred nations of those times, and this is a great acquisition in confirmation of the truthfulness of that record. In 1830, when the "Book of Mormon" was published, these things were not known, and were not discovered until after the year 1841, and by far the larger proportion much later, except some superficial view of some of the ancient ruins may have been had by the warring Spaniards that entered some parts of the country.

The "Book of Mormon" says, that there was a decadence in after centuries of the intelligent race that settled in that country; that their enemies, an ignorant and warlike race, prevailed against them, and the refined nation was utterly destroyed, and their civilization obliterated by their vicious, stupid, and blood-thirsty conquerors. Mr. Nadaillac confirms this as follows:—

"In every direction, for an extent of several leagues [describing the ruins of a vast ancient city], long lines of massive walls, huacas, palaces, aqueducts, reservoirs of water, and granaries can be made out. Everything proves the power and wealth of a people, *the very name of whom has remained uncertain.*" — *Ibid.*, page 395.

Again:—

"At every turn South America presents vestiges of a vanished race, of a culture now lost; and we are always compelled to one conclusion as to our absolute powerlessness to decide on



the origin or cause of the decadence of these races, now represented by a few miserable savages without a past, as without a future." — *Ibid.*, page 465.

The "Book of Mormon" affirms that this ancient nation not only possessed the art of writing, but that they wrote (engraved) upon metallic plates, — gold, brass, copper, etc. The plates in Mr. Smith's possession, from which the characters in question were taken, were gold, about as thick as common tin, and beautifully engraved. In 1830, when the "Book of Mormon" was first published, we were told that savages did not engrave, and knew nothing of gold plates (indicating that a civilized and intelligent people never lived upon the continent of America); but Mr. Nadaillac writes, on page 413 of his work, in speaking of the Temple of the Sun, and says it was named the "town of gold." "Squires relates having seen, in various houses in Cuzco, sheets of gold preserved as relics which came from the Temple of the Sun. These plaques, he tells us, were scarcely as thick as a common sheet of paper." This, too, confirms Smith's announcement. They "were acquainted with bronze, copper, tin, lead, gold, and silver," and "their chief object was the fabrication of gold and silver objects." (*Ibid.*, page 463.)

Further, Mr. Stephens, after having explored the old ruins of Palenque, "palaces, temples, and public buildings," concludes his description and remarks concerning what he saw, as follows: —

"What we had before our eyes was grand, curious, and remarkable enough. Here were the remains of a cultivated, polished, and peculiar people, who had passed through all the

stages incident to the rise and fall of nations, reached their golden age, and perished entirely unknown. The links that connected them with the human family were severed and lost, and these were the only memorials of their footsteps upon earth. We lived in the ruined palace of their kings, we went up to their desolate temples and fallen altars, and wherever we moved we saw the evidence of their taste, their skill in arts, their wealth and power." — STEPHENS, *Travels in Central America, Chiapas, and Yucatan*, Vol. II., page 356.

Speaking of the ruins of Palenque, Mr. Short says : —

"Four hundred yards south of the palace stands the ruins of a pyramid and temple. . . . The temple faces the east, and on the western wall of its inner apartment, itself facing the eastern light, is found (or rather was, for it has now entirely disappeared) the most beautiful specimen of stucco relief in America. M. Waldec, with the critical insight of an experienced artist, declares it 'worthy to be compared to the most beautiful works of the age of Augustus.' He therefore named the temple the Beau Relief. . . . Correctness of design and graceful outlines predominate to such an extent, that we may safely pronounce the beautiful youth who sits enthroned in his elaborate and artistic throne, the American Apollo. In the original drawing the grace of the arms and wrists is truly matchless, and the chest and muscles are displayed in the most perfect manner."

"The next subject of interest to the student of sculpture is found in the Temple of the Cross, in the inmost sanctuary of all, and is known as the tablet of the cross. Three stones covered most of the surface of the rear wall of the *sanctum sanctorum*, and present an area six feet, four inches high, by ten feet eight inches wide. . . . The two lateral stones (the left-hand one being shown in our cut) are covered with hieroglyphics, which begin at the left-hand upper corner with a large capital letter. . . . By referring to the hieroglyphic tablet at the left of the cross, it will be observed that just below the large initial or word is a threefold hieroglyphic, while seven others in the

same column are double. This would indicate, we should think, that the characters were read from the top downwards." — *The North Americans*, by SHORT, pages 387-391.

Here is skill exhibited in architecture, science, and the arts, and the work so fixed, and sturdy, and beautiful, as to be worthy to be compared with the finest models known. A language, a writing, is also revealed, — beautiful engravings, — and strange to announce, like Mr. Smith's characters presented to Prof. Anthon, they are arranged in columns, and are supposed to have been read from top to bottom. Smith's characters are still found to be in the line of facts.

Further : —

"We must give attention to one fact that has peculiar significance," says Mr. Baldwin. "The zodiac, representing the apparent path of the sun in the heavens, with the name and symbolical figures of its signs substantially the same, was common to Chaldea, India, Egypt, and Arabia. Sometimes eleven signs were counted, the claws of the scorpion representing the sign known as Libra. Sextus, Empiricus, and others stated that the zodiac, as we have it, came directly from the Chaldeans. The great similarity of the zodiacs used in Egypt, India, and the countries of Western Asia shows that they must have had a common origin, and to find their origin we must go to the older people who gave all these countries civilization, and prepared them to become great." — *Prehistoric Nations*, page 117.

Admitting this announcement as true, that the zodiac had a common origin among all of the Old World peoples, the Greeks and Romans having received it from the Chaldeans and Egyptians, the argument is still in favor of the claims of the "Book of Mormon," for a knowledge of the zodiac and astronomy was had

among the prehistoric people that inhabited Central America, of whom it is affirmed that they came out from the ancient Chaldeans, and possessed a knowledge of their arts and learning. They also understood astronomy, and had astronomical instruments and observatories.

The following is in proof that the prehistoric peoples of America did possess a knowledge of the zodiac, the same as the ancient Chaldeans, Egyptians, Arabians, and Greeks : —

“The calendar system of Mayas and Nahuas present analogies to the system employed by the Persians, Egyptians, and certain Asiatic nations, and the presumption is very strong that the latter furnished the ground-plan upon which the Nahua system was constructed. The accuracy of the Aztec calendar must ever be a monument to their intellectual culture, and an undeniable proof of the advanced state of ancient Mexican civilization.” — *North Americans*, by SHORT, page 519.

Again : —

“The antiquities of Mexico and Central America reveal religious symbols, devices, and ideas nearly identical with those found in all countries of the Old World where Cushite communities formerly existed. . . . He [Humboldt] found evidence of it in the religious symbols, the architecture, the hieroglyphics, and the social customs made manifest by ruins, which he was sure came from the other side of the ocean.” — *Prehistoric Nations*, page 393.

Further : —

“The ruins show that they had the art of writing, and that at the south this art was more developed, more like a phonetic system of writing, than that found in use among the Aztecs. The inscriptions of Palenque, and the characters used in some of the manuscript books that have been preserved, are not the same as the Mexican picture-writing. It is known that books

or manuscript writings were abundant among them in the ages previous to the Aztec period. They had an accurate measure of the solar year, and a system of chronology, and many of their writings were historical." — *Ancient America*, page 187.

Here is furnished ample support (and this is not a tithe at hand) for Mr. Smith's characters, which were submitted to Prof. Anthon and Dr. Mitchell, even accepting the statement of Prof. Anthon himself, as having had a legitimate origin, and were true characters as claimed, — "Greek," "Hebrew," "Roman letters," "flourishes," "circles," etc., — rather than to presumptuously conclude them to have been a fraud, and obtained by copying from the Greek, Hebrew, and other ancient alphabets, simply because no one believed, at that time, in the administration of angels, or that a civilized and highly cultivated people had at one time dwelt upon this continent previous to its discovery by Columbus. The illiterate Smith believed in both, and advocated both as being true in fact, having obtained his knowledge from the characters upon the plates. The latter claim is now conceded by every one. Smith's foresight, given by divine inspiration, was a long way ahead of the scholar.

Further : —

"The ruins of ancient Peru are found chiefly on the elevated table-lands of the Andes, between Quito and Lake Titicaca, but they can be traced five hundred miles farther south to Chili, and throughout the region connecting these high plateaus with the Pacific coast. The great district to which they belong extends north and south about two thousand miles. . . . The Peruvian ruins show us remains of cities, temples, palaces, other edifices of various kinds, fortresses, aqueducts (one of

them four hundred and fifty miles long), great roads (extending through the whole length of the empire), and terraces on the sides of mountains. For all these constructions the builders used cut stone laid in mortar or cement, and their work was done admirably."

Cieca de Leon, speaking of the ruins of Lake Titicaca, says : —

"There are stones so large and so overgrown that our wonder is incited, it being incomprehensible how the power of man could have placed them where we see them. . . . Large gateways with hinges, platforms, and porches, each made of a single stone. It surprised me to see these enormous gateways made of great masses of stone, some of which were thirty feet long, fifteen high, and six thick.

"In some respects, the Peruvian civilization was developed to such a degree as challenged admiration. The Peruvians were highly skilled in agriculture and in some kinds of manufactures. No people ever had a more efficient system of industry. This created their wealth, and made possible their great public works." — *Ancient America*, by BALDWIN, pages 222, 223, 232, 233, and 247.

These citations speak for themselves. The ancient remains to which they refer are located precisely where the "Book of Mormon" assigns them, or rather where it affirms the ancient inhabitants made their first and among their largest settlements.

"No American people," says the Marquis de Nadaillac, "has surpassed the Peruvians in the manufacture of woven tissues. The cotton they cultivated in the warm and humid valleys, with the wool of llamas, alpacas, and vicuñas, supplied excellent material. They knew the art of dyeing, the stuff was often woven in wool of different colors, and by this means the most varied designs were obtained in the woof. The cotton cloths, generally of great fineness, were dyed in different colors,

and the workmen knew how, by combinations of ornaments or figures, to obtain the most happy results."—*Prehistoric America*, page 449.

This further confirms the claim that there was a highly civilized and cultivated race, who dwelt in South America in prehistoric times, as announced in the interpretation of the characters in Joseph Smith's possession.

Let us examine a little further into the facts relating to the mound-builders. On this subject, Mr. Baldwin writes as follows :—

"A careful study of what is shown in the many reports on these ancient remains seems plainly to authorize the conclusion that the mound-builders entered the country at the south, and began their settlements near the Gulf."

So declared Smith's characters, long before these scientific discoveries were made.

"Remains of their works have been traced through a great extent of country. They are found in West Virginia, and are spread through Michigan, Wisconsin, and Iowa to Nebraska. . . . Most numerous in Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Missouri, Arkansas, Kentucky, Tennessee, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, and Texas.

"That appears to me the most reasonable suggestion which assumes that the mound-builders came originally from Mexico and Central America. . . . Coming from Mexico and Central America, they would begin their settlements on the Gulf coast, and afterwards advance gradually up the river to the Ohio Valley. It seems evident that they came by this route."—*Ancient America*, pages 31 and 70.

This further confirms the statements found in the "Book of Mormon," that the first settlements made upon this continent, in primeval times, were made in

Central and South America, and that the migrations of the people were from south to north.

Bear in mind that Peru is the identical spot, or nearly so, affirmed by the "Book of Mormon" that the colony of Nephites landed that came out from Jerusalem six hundred years before the birth of the Saviour, and commenced to build a nation and people in South America. The way-marks in the "Book of Mormon" are clearly and definitely set out, so there can be no mistaking the locality. This finding of antiquated cities; great roads, that cost an immense capital and skill to make them (one single road in Peru is supposed to have cost more to build it than it did to build the whole of the Union Pacific Railway); aqueducts extending hundreds of miles; reservoirs and cisterns; magnificent temples, palaces, towers, and monuments; with utensils of ordinary use in life among thriving, enterprising, and intelligent communities,—all unite to confirm the story of the "Book of Mormon," that this was the seat of a thrifty, intelligent, and industrious prehistoric people; yet these discoveries, so far as being made known to the great world, have been made since the publication of the "Book of Mormon." Did Smith guess at this, and put it in the plates? or did he really get it from the plates himself, as claimed? Which is the more reasonable? Smith never travelled, and knew but little of letters, so he could not have acquired this information. No other person could, for these discoveries were not then made.

The writer of the "Book of Mormon" could not have known, were it but the emanations of some mere man



who lived in these modern times, for this fact was not determined by the scientists at the time of his publication, but long since. Human sagacity could not have determined it from anything known in the world. The guesses (?) of the "Book of Mormon" proved to be as valid and exact as the predictions of the Bible. Is it consistent, then, to declare one to be reliable, and to contain true history and prophecy, and the other but guess-work and the invention of men?

The following is in further confirmation of the position taken in the "Book of Mormon" that the earliest settlers upon the American continent understood the habits, customs, arts, and sciences of the ancient Egyptians: —

"No claim has been advanced, we believe, which advocates an actual Egyptian colonization of the New World, but strong arguments have been used to show that the architecture and sculpture of Central America and Mexico have been influenced from Egypt, if not attributable directly to Egyptian artisans. These arguments are based on the resemblance between the gigantic pyramids, the sculptured obelisks, and the numerous idols of these prehistoric countries and those of Egypt. It requires no practised eye to trace a resemblance in general features, though it must be said that the details of American architecture and sculpture are peculiarly original in design." — BANCROFT'S *Native Races*, page 122. *The North Americans of Antiquity*, by JOHN T. SHORT, page 147.

"The fact that Cortez found the Julian reckoning, employed by his own and every other nation, to be more than ten days in error when tried by the Aztec system, — a system the almost perfect accuracy of which was proven by the adjustments which took place under Gregory XIII., in 1582 A. D., — excites our wonder and admiration. How the Nahuas, whether Toltec or Aztec we know not, were able to approximate the true

length of the year within two minutes and nine seconds, thus almost rivalling the accuracy of the learned astronomers of the Caliph Almamon, is a mystery. The venerable civilization of the Mayas, whose forest-grown cities and crumbling temples hold entombed a history of vanished glory, no doubt belongs to the remotest period of North American antiquity. It was old when the Nahuas, then a comparatively rude people, first came in contact with it, adopted many of its features, and engrafted upon it new life." — *North Americans of Antiquity*, by SHORT, page 519.

In the old seats of empire in America, Dr. Foster communicates,

#### OF THE WRITTEN LANGUAGE,

the following : —

"The hieroglyphics displayed upon the walls of Copan, in horizontal or perpendicular rows, would indicate a written language in which the pictorial significance had largely disappeared, and a kind of word-writing had become predominant. Intermingled with the pictorial devices are apparently purely arbitrary characters which may be alphabetic. This, however, may be said, that in Central American hieroglyphics we have a highly artificial system of writing, to interpret which the Aztec picture-writing affords no aid." — *Prehistoric Races in the United States of America*, by J. W. FOSTER, LL. D., page 322.

Says Prof. Rafenesque : —

"The glyphs of Otolun [an ancient city of America] are written from top to bottom, like the Chinese, or from side to side indifferently, like the Egyptian and the Demotic Lybians. Although the most common way of writing the groups is in rows, and each group separated, yet we find some formed, as it were, in oblong squares or tablets, like those of Egypt." — *Atlantic Journal* for 1832.

The reader will please note that these characters, as described, were arranged very much as were those sub-

mitted by Messrs. Smith and Harris to Prof. Anthon, Anthon being the witness; yet Prof. Rafenesque's discovery was made subsequent to Mr. Smith's characters being submitted to Prof. Anthon. This also confirms Smith's claim that his characters were true ones, and also further supports the claim of the "Book of Mormon," that these ancient inhabitants were an intelligent race of people, and possessed a written language.

But whether the prehistoric nations of America possessed a written language which contained characters that resemble those found in the old Egyptian, Chaldaic, Arabic, Greek, and Hebrew languages or not, is the question at issue; and for the benefit of those controverting this position, the evidences on this subject are here extended. It follows, as may be readily seen, that if the prehistoric nations who at one time inhabited America did possess a written language containing characters resembling those found in the Hebrew, Greek, Egyptian, and Chaldaic languages, etc., that Mr. Smith's claim of having had in his possession true characters — the ancient language of these lost nations — is sustained, and the "Book of Mormon" is proven to be a true record; for Mr. Smith was the first and only one to announce to the world that such a nation of people did inhabit America, and that they understood the Hebrew, Egyptian, Chaldaic, and Arabic languages; or rather it is said the characters which he submitted to the learned, which he affirmed were the writings of these ancient nations, resembled characters found in the Egyptian, Greek, Hebrew, Roman, Chaldaic, and Arabic languages.

On the 23d of April, 1843, while some parties were digging in a mound near Kinderhook, Pike County, Illinois, they made the discovery of "six brass plates" (see plate No. 2), "with four lines of characters or hieroglyphics on each." A description of the plates, and the manner of finding them, was published in the *Quincy Whig* at the time, a part of which is as follows :—

"After penetrating the mound about eleven feet, they came to a bed of limestone, that had apparently been subjected to the action of fire. They removed the stones, which were small and easy to handle, to the depth of two feet or more, when they found SIX BRASS PLATES, secured and fastened together by two iron wires, but which were so decayed that they readily crumbled to dust upon being handled. The plates were so completely covered with rust as almost to obliterate the characters inscribed upon them; but after undergoing a chemical process, the inscriptions were brought out plain and distinct. There were six plates, four inches in length, one and three quarters wide at the top, and two inches and three quarters wide at the bottom, flaring out to points. There are four lines of characters, or hieroglyphics, on each. On one side of the plates are parallel lines running lengthwise. A few of the characters resemble in their forms the Roman capitals of our alphabet; for instance, the capital B and X appear very distinct. In addition, there are rude representations of three human heads on one of the plates, the largest in the middle. From this head proceed marks or rays resembling those which usually surround the head of Christ in the pictorial illustrations of his person. There are also figures of two trees with branches, one under each of the two small heads, both leaning a little to the right. One of the plates has on it the figure of a large head by itself, with two hands pointing directly to it. On each side of the mound in which this discovery was made was a mound, on one of which is a tree growing that

measures two feet and a half in diameter near the ground, showing the great antiquity of the mounds, and of course all that is buried within them."

The finding of these plates is attested by nine witnesses, viz., Robert Niley, George Dickenson, W. Longnecker, G. W. F. Ward, J. R. Sharp, Ira S. Curtis, Fayette Grubb, W. P. Harris, and W. Fugate.

There are characters on these plates that resemble letters in the Egyptian, Greek, Roman, Chaldaic, and Hebrew alphabets, and they are arranged in columns, resembling very much in form and arrangement, according to Prof. Anthon, the ones that were submitted to him by Mr. Harris, as copied by Mr. Smith from the plates in his possession, from which he translated the "Book of Mormon"; yet none would be so audacious as to presume to say that they had been copied by some "bungling" hand, with the various ancient alphabets, as mentioned, before him, with a view to perpetrate a fraud. Prof. Anthon decided too hastily upon Smith's characters, because the idea of miracle was attached to the discovery of them. These scientific revealments confirm Smith's claim, and condemn Prof. Anthon's hasty conclusion.

Prof. Rafenesque further states:—

"By the great variety of Egyptian forms of the same letters I thought that I could trace some resemblance with our American glyphs. In fact, I could see in them the Egyptian cross, snake, circle, delta, square, trident, eye, feather, fish, hand, etc., but sought in vain for the birds, lions, sphynx, beetle, and a hundred other nameless signs of Egypt. . . . I was delighted to find it so explicit, so well connected with the Egyptian, being also an acrostic alphabet, and, above all, to find that all its

signs were to be seen in the glyphs of Otolun, the American city (Palenque). The numerical analogy is thirty-two per cent with the Egyptian." — *Ruins Revised by an Americanist*, S. F. WALKER, page 175.

Again, says Dr. LePlongeon : —

"I must speak of that language which has survived unaltered through the vicissitudes of the nations that spoke it thousands of years ago, and is yet the general tongue in Yucatan, — the Maya. . . . The Maya, containing words from almost every language, ancient or modern, is well worth the attention of philologists. . . . One third of the tongue is pure Greek. Who brought the dialect of Homer to America? Or who took to Greece that of the Mayas? Greek is the offspring of the Sanscrit. Is Maya? Or are they coeval? . . . The Maya is not devoid of words from the Assyrians." — *Ruins Revised*, page 176.

"The Maya language seems to be one of the oldest tongues spoken by man, since it contains words and expressions of all, or nearly all, of the known polished languages of the earth." — *Ibid.*, page 177.

"The Mayas had signs and characters identical with the Egyptians; possessing the same alphabetical and symbolical value in both nations. Among the symbolical I might mention a few, — water, country, king, lord, offering, splendor. . . . A, I, X, and pp. are identical with the Etruscan. . . . Certain signs and symbols were used by the affiliated [in the Maya mysteries] that are perfectly identical with those used among the Masons in their symbolical lodges." — *Ibid.*, page 180.

Accepting, as has been proved, that the old Cushite civilization brought the arts and sciences from Arabia into Western Asia, Chaldea, Egypt, and Canaan, and that from their alphabet that of the Greek, together with all of the alphabets of modern Europe, were derived, and that from them was learned the science of

astronomy, the mechanical arts, a knowledge of the zodiac, and how to construct the vast superstructures that exist in all of the countries where this people have dwelt, together with the fact that a colony representing this old civilization, when it was in the height of its power and scientific and intellectual attainments, came to America from Babel, and here settled, built, flourished, and became a great nation; also that a colony, indeed two of them, of similar origin and culture, directly from the Semitic line, possessing a knowledge of all that was known among the Egyptians, Jews, and all the nations round about, came directly from Jerusalem some six hundred years before Christ, and settled in America, and in process of time these latter colonies, whose language was derived from the old Cushite and Semitic tongues, containing "pure Greek," became acquainted with the language of the older people that came out from Babel, possessed their records, became familiar with their architecture, manner of life, language, etc., and Dr. LePlongeon's question, as to how "pure Greek" became known among the Mayas of Central America, is answered. Much of their tongue was "pure Greek" to begin with. The Greeks learned from Chaldea, Arabia, and Egypt. There is where they obtained their alphabet. The ancestors of the Maya race of Central America learned in the same school. So declares science. So says the "Book of Mormon." Homer, Hesiod, Solon, and all other Greeks and Romans received their knowledge of letters from this common source, the Cushite or Semitic tongue, which, up to Babel, were identical. "The whole earth was of one

language and of one speech." The Hebrew and other kindred languages were from the same source, only deflections. So the "Book of Mormon" still stands like a very Gibraltar, undisturbed by ridicule, scathing criticism, or scientific demonstration. Is it not time that we grow a little serious and think of things as they are, and not as we would like to have them?

Again: on the 10th of January, 1877, there were found near Davenport, Iowa, "two tablets of coal slate, covered with a variety of figures and hieroglyphics." In the report of the Davenport Academy for 1882 is an interpretation of tablets found in a mound in that vicinity, including, doubtless, the ones discovered in 1877. (See plate 3.) The report says:—

"The tablets Nos. I., III., and IV. contain nearly two hundred characters, of which, however, sixteen occur several times. The remaining one hundred and fifty or more different figures, the human and animal delineations not being taken into the account, demonstrate that the primitive inhabitants of the country did not use the simple Noachian alphabet of twenty-five letters, but a great number of syllabic signs, originated from the said alphabet, as was and still is the case in Egypt, Japan, Corea, China, and Central America."

Again:—

"Plate III. This tablet . . . represents a planetary configuration, the twelve signs of the zodiac, known to all nations of old, and the seven planets, conjoined with six different signs. . . . The figures of the signs are the same which we find depicted on Egyptian, Greek, Roman, and other monuments. . . . The signs Aries, Taurus, Gemini are plain enough. Gemini is expressed by two sitting children, like the constellation of Gemini, at present Castor and Pollux. Capricornus



was, as we learn from the astronomical monuments of the Egyptians, a species of antelope, and the same animal, though a little deformed, resembles our Capricornus." — *Ruins Revisited*, page 209.

These citations from standard authors clearly show that there was a civilized, intelligent, and highly cultivated nation or nations that inhabited America in pre-historic times, and that their first and early settlements and great centres of population, refinement, and wealth were made in Central and South America, and afterward in North America; that they possessed a written language, and understood sculpture, building, ornamentation, which resemble in a special manner the style of the old Egyptian; and, also, there are to be found Hebrew, Greek, Chaldaic, Roman, and Assyriac letters; mammoth superstructures, mounds, and pyramids, rivalling the most wonderful in huge dimension found in Egypt, Chaldea, Arabia, Ionia, Greece, Rome, or Canaan. All of this confirms the historical statements of the "Sealed Book" brought to light, that the ancient inhabitants of America were of Jewish and Cushite, or Semitic, origin, and that they brought with them their respective languages and customs, and left their impress here in the New World.

Before, or about the time of, the arrival of the two colonies of Jews to the continent, the old Jaredite nation had attained its highest ascendancy, deteriorated, and became extinct. So says the "Book of Mormon," and so says the universal testimony of the Indian, north and south; that is, their places of habitation were here when the ancestors of the Indian came: and scientific research confirms these statements.

There is something of marked significance in a statement found on page 425 of "North Americans of Antiquity," in regard to the word "Mulek." The "Book of Mormon" affirms that at the time the Jews were taken captive to Babylon, "Mulek," one of the sons of Zedekiah, came over, with others, to this continent, and settled in Central America; and in the account above referred to, the statement is made that, "By means of Landa's key, Mr. Ballaert translated some of the hieroglyphics found in Yucatan, and the word 'Mulek,' or 'Muluc,' as written by Short, was deciphered, and was found to mean 'to unite,' 'reunion.'" Considering that historical statement in the "Book of Mormon," that there was a union formed, or federation between the Nephites and Mulekites in Central America, in primeval times, and it goes far to prove that there was something more than fancy and guess-work, the emanations from the brains of mere men, that inspired the revelation of the "Book of Mormon." This word "Mulek" was also applied to one of the days of their months, seemingly to retain it in memorial. Who can question that if so good a coincident or discovery had been made in support of the Bible, from Egypt, Chaldea, Babylon, Tyre, or elsewhere, it would not have been hailed as a great finding, and would be used as a club to hurl at the head of the scoffing infidel, because so pusillanimous and persistent in refusing the truth when the facts were so patent? What, then, should believers in the "Book of Mormon" say to doubting Christians, who persist in disregarding these plain evidences that support the Christ idea? When the Mulekites and Nephites first

met, as the narrative shows, they could not understand each other's language. After inquiry and study, they were able to communicate, and were delighted to learn of each other's origin, and history, and speech. They also possessed the records of the Jaredites, and the ancient remains of the latter covered the land. Here was a writing and mingling of the languages of three distinct nationalities, — two of Jewish origin, learned in the language of the Egyptians; the other, the old Cushite, with possible changes made by time and events, the very language from whence was derived the Greek and "all the languages of modern Europe."

It would be but natural that leading features of these languages would be introduced or united, and made the common language of the united people and future nation. In confirmation of this, the following is in point : —

"The study of languages affords a reliable guide in tracing the migration of tribes, even when they have become intermingled with other tribes. In the social relations thus established there would not result a total obliteration of the language of the one tribe, but certain words and forms of speech would be adopted and perpetuated." — *Prehistoric Races of the United States*, page 318.

In the light of the above we have a legitimate origin for all of the peculiar characters submitted by Mr. Smith to Prof. Anthon and Dr. Mitchell, — "Greek," "Hebrew," "Assyrian," "Chaldaic," "Roman letters," "circles and flourishes," — the "Book of Mormon" speaking for itself, as confirmed by facts brought to light in modern archaeological discoveries. Also ample

ground for Dr. LePlongeon's "pure Greek" found in Yucatan and Central America. So all of the facts go to show that Mr. Smith was right in his claim to have possessed and translated the records of the prehistoric nations of America, and the characters which he submitted to Prof. Anthon were correct ones, and the criticism that they contained Greek, Hebrew, Chaldaic letters, circles and flourishes, etc., is in support of his claim rather than against, for it is now known that a people conversant with those languages, or the ground plan of them, did, at one time, inhabit this Western Continent. Strange to say, it was almost upon the same parallel of latitude that the metallic plates of Illinois, the coal-slate tablets of Davenport, Iowa, and the gold plates obtained by Mr. Smith in Northern New York, were found, and the characters on each in some respects resemble those upon the other, Prof. Anthon being witness. Let truth prevail, though all men oppose.

Again, the Marquis de Nadaillac writes :—

"In the province Tarapaca, considerable surfaces are covered, not only with figures of men and animals, most of them of a remarkable execution, but also with characters which appear to be written vertically. I am disposed to attach more importance to the discoveries of Prof. Librariani, in Santa Maria Valley, Province of Catamarca, in the Argentine Republic. He describes figures of animate objects, geometrical figures, and lines of dots differently combined. The same signs are met with (and this is a fact worthy of attention), constantly repeated, and always in a similar order. Ameghino considers these inscriptions to indicate a complete system of writing, made up partly of figures and symbolical characters,

partly of purely phonetic characters; and he is even disposed to admit that these are remains of ancient Peruvian writing." — *Prehistoric America*, pages 255, 256.

Again : —

"There is a very distinct resemblance in some of these hieroglyphics [of Central America] to those of Egypt." — *Ibid.*, page 328.

"Above the door, and simulating windows (in the valley of Yucay, one of the tributaries of the Amazon), we meet again with the Egyptian *tau* that we have already seen at Palenque." — *Ibid.*, page 417.

"The ornamentation of the buildings resembling that upon Egyptian monuments." — *Ibid.*, page 324.

"Statues resemble those of Egypt, and head-dress a little like that of the Assyrians." — *Ibid.*, page 327.

"They had a knowledge of astronomy, and were acquainted with the divisions of time founded upon the motion of the sun." — *Ibid.*, page 305.

"Possessed astronomical instruments." — *SHORT*, page 43.

"They wore a head-dress which has been pronounced Egyptian." — *Ibid.*, page 392.

These evidences all unite, and confirm the truth of the claims of the "Book of Mormon," that it answers to the prediction found in the twenty-ninth chapter of Isaiah concerning the "Sealed Book," and that it came forth in fulfilment thereof; that it is a true record of the ancient inhabitants of America; and that they did occupy this land in prehistoric times, and were an intelligent, God-fearing, and accomplished race of people; that they understood the arts and sciences, and had a regular and well-defined system of writing; that their alphabet was derived from the old original alphabet, from which all the alphabets of modern Europe

were derived, and was composed of characters identical with and resembling the Egyptian, Chaldaic, Assyrian, Greek, Hebrew, and Roman letters, with symbols, circles, and pictorial emblems; that they understood the Hebrew and Egyptian language and customs of social life and architectural building and ornamentation; that they engraved upon stone and metallic plates; made gold plates; that the ancient nations are extinct; that they were conquered, overcome, and destroyed by a wild, ferocious, and savage race of people, who spared neither old nor young, male nor female; that the emigration was from south to north; that the oldest nation was destroyed ere the second colony of civilized people settled upon the continent; that the very names of these older nations are unknown, living only in their monumental remains, that testify of their existence, greatness, power, wisdom, and glory, all of which is absolutely outlined and affirmed in the "Book of Mormon" itself. These ancient inhabitants possessed a "knowledge of the Jews and the language of the Egyptians," and of course their customs, social, political, religious, architectural, and scientific.

In the light of these facts, affirmed by the "Book of Mormon" and confirmed by scientific demonstration, it is possible, yes, highly probable, from the scientific evidences themselves, that the alphabetical characters which constitute the writings of these ancient peoples would resemble very much those affirmed by Prof. Anthon, was submitted to him by Messrs. Joseph Smith and Martin Harris: "all kinds of crooked characters disposed in columns. . . . Greek and Hebrew

letters, crosses and flourishes, Roman letters, inverted or placed sideways, were arranged in perpendicular columns, etc. ; Egyptian, Chaldaic, Assyrian, and Arabic characters," as evidenced by Mr. Harris. Thus scientific disclosures confirm the truth of the "Book of Mormon," and support the claim of Joseph Smith, Jr., that he had in his possession the ancient records of these ancient nations, and the characters which he had submitted to Prof. Anthon and Dr. Mitchell were true ones.

## CHAPTER XII.

### THE TESTIMONY OF NUMEROUS AUTHORS.

IN further proof that there was an utter apostasy from the primitive Christian faith after the death of the apostles, and a reign of cruel tyranny, imbecility, idolatry, and monstrous vices and absurdities ensued, under the name of the Christian religion, the testimony of a number of authors is here quoted in evidence. Also, further proof in relation to the rise, progress, and dominion of the "Man of Sin"; the intolerance, cruelty, and oppression of that power, and its present purpose toward the liberties of the people and the civilized world, together with other condensed history and reference of benefit to the searchers after truth. The Saviour and the apostles not only predicted the apostasy and rise of the sinful kingdom, but the early Christians were forewarned concerning it, and looked forward to its coming. Says Tertullian: "Christians are under a particular necessity of praying for the Emperor [of Rome] and for the continued state of the Empire; because we know that dreadful power which hangs over the world, and the *conclusion of the age, which threatens the most horrible evils, is restrained by the continuance of the time appointed by the Roman Empire.* This is what we would not experience; and while we pray that it may be deferred, we hereby show our good-will to the perpetuity of the Roman state." (TERTULLIAN'S *Apology*, Chap. XXXII.) — *History of Romanism*, pages 28, 29.

"Nothing could be more simple and unpretending than the form of church organization and government in primitive times. Each church consisted of a company of believers



in the Lord Jesus, united in covenant relationship, for the worship of God, the maintenance of gospel doctrines, and the due administration of the ordinances appointed by Christ. 'Every church,' says Waddington, an Episcopalian, 'in the management of its internal affairs, was essentially independent of every other. . . . The churches formed a sort of federative body of independent religious communities, dispersed through the greater part of the empire, in continual communication and in constant harmony with each other.'" — WADDINGTON, *Church History*, page 43. *History of Romanism*, page 36.

"According to New Testament usage, the title of bishop belonged to presbyters or elders. Soon after the death of the apostles, however, this title began to be claimed exclusively by such as sought pre-eminence over their brethren in the ministry. . . . After the death of the apostles and the pupils of the apostles, to whom the general direction of the church had always been conceded, some one among the presbyters of each church was suffered gradually to take the lead in its affairs. In the same irregular way the title of *ἐπίσκοπος* (bishop) was appropriated to the first presbyter. Hence the different accounts of the order of the first bishops in the church at Rome." — GIESELER'S *Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. I., page 65.

"In process of time, all the Christian churches of a province were formed into one large ecclesiastical body, which, like confederate states, assembled at certain times, in order to deliberate about the common interests of the whole. This institution had its origin among the Greeks, with whom nothing was more common than this confederacy of independent states. . . . These *councils*, of which we find not the smallest trace before the middle of the second century, changed the whole face of the church, and gave it a new form." — *Ibid.*, pages 37, 38.

“Soon after Constantine’s professed conversion to Christianity (in the year 312) he undertook to remodel the government of the church, so as to make it conform as much as possible to the government of the state. Hence the origin of the dignities of patriarchs, exarchs, archbishops, canons, prebendaries, etc., intended by the Emperor to correspond with the different secular offices and dignities connected with the civil administration of the Empire. Taking these newly constituted dignitaries of the church into his own special favor, he loaded them with wealth and worldly honors, and richly endowed the churches over which they presided. . . . From this time onward, the progress of priestly domination and tyranny was far more rapid than in any previous age. The lofty title of patriarch was assumed by the bishops of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, and also of Constantinople, after the removal of the seat of the Empire to that city, claiming, according to Bingham (*‘Antiquities,’* B. II., Chap. XVII.), ‘the right to ordain all the metropolitans of their own diocese; to call diocesan synods, and to preside over them,’ etc.” — *Ibid.*, page 31.

“The bishops of the three great cities of the Roman Empire, Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, according to the learned and accurate Gieseler, had the largest dioceses. Hence they were considered as the heads of the church, and in all general affairs particular deference was paid to their opinions.” — *Ibid.*, page 32.

“Constantine has been styled the first Christian Emperor. During one of his campaigns (A. D. 312) he is said to have seen a miraculous vision of a luminous cross in the heavens, on which were inscribed the following words, *‘In hoc signo vinces,’* — *‘By this conquer.’* Certain it is, that from this period, Constantine showed the Christians marks of positive favor, and caused the cross to be employed as the imperial standard; in his last battle with Licinius, it was the emblem

of the cross that was opposed to the symbols of paganism; and as the latter went down in a night of blood, the triumph of Christianity over the Roman world was deemed complete.

“The most important events in the reign of Constantine, after he had restored the outward unity of the Empire, were his wars with Sarmatians and Goths, whom he severely chastised, and his domestic difficulties, in which he showed little of the character of a Christian; also the establishment at Byzantium of the new capital of the Roman Empire, afterwards called *Constantinople*, from its founder. The motives which led Constantine to the choice of a new capital on a spot which seemed formed by nature to be the metropolis of a great empire, were those of policy and interest, mingled with feelings of revenge for insults which he had received at Rome, where he was execrated for abandoning the religion of his forefathers.” — *Outline of History*, by MARCIUS WILSON, page 123.

Constantine “assumed to unite in his own person the civil and ecclesiastical dominion, and claimed the power of convening councils and presiding in them, and of regulating the external affairs of the church.”

The bishop of Rome far surpassed all others in the magnificence and splendor of the church over which he presided. It was the centre of wealth and power. The bishop is said to have outdone princes in the expense of his tables, sumptuous feasts, rich coaches, and costly array and display. “This led Prætextatus, a heathen, who was prefect of the city, to say, ‘Make me bishop of Rome, and I will be a Christian, too!’” — ARMINIUS MARCELLINUS, Liber XXVII., Chap. XXXI.

“It is true that so early as the second century, Victor, bishop of Rome, had attempted to lord it over his brethren of the East.” — *History of Romanism*, pages 32 and 34.

There was a rivalry between Rome and Constantinople,

the two seats of empire. Hitherto the chief city had the chief bishop. Rome was overrun by barbarians, and was on the decline. Constantinople, the seat of civilization, was on the ascendancy. There was a conflict between the bishops of these respective cities of power and wealth, as to which would be recognized as the greatest in the esteem of the popular will. There was nothing settled as to who carried the "keys" of St. Peter, or who was his successor. Earthly power and opulence were the means of dignifying and making prominent bishops.

"The council of Chalcedon was held A. D. 451, and notwithstanding the pre-eminence assumed therein by the legate of the bishop of Rome, he had not power or influence to prevent the passage of a canon which proved extremely odious to his lordly master, Leo, who has been surnamed the Great, and which resulted in a protracted and bitter controversy between the bishops of Rome and Constantinople, as to who should be greatest. Some years previous to this time, since the removal of the seat of the empire to Constantinople, the ambition and assumption of the bishop of Constantinople had almost equalled that of Rome. He had lately usurped the spiritual government of the provinces of Asia Minor, Thrace, Pontus, and the eastern part of Illyricum, very much to the chagrin and dissatisfaction of Leo. This dissatisfaction was increased when, by the twenty-eighth canon of the council of Chalcedon, it was resolved that the same rights and honors which had been conferred upon the bishop of Rome were due to the bishop of Constantinople, on account of the equal dignity and lustre of the two cities in which these prelates exercised their authority. The same council confirmed also, by solemn act, the bishop of Constantinople in the spiritual government of these provinces over which he had ambitiously usurped the jurisdiction." — *Ibid.*, page 41.

“By general consent a kind of superiority of rank had long been conceded to the bishop of Rome, chiefly from the fact that that city was the first in rank and importance, and the ancient capital of the Empire; and upon the same ground it was that the council of Chalcedon, already referred to, ‘proceeding on the principle that the *importance of a bishop depended alone on the political consequence of the city in which he lived*, decreed the same rights to the bishop of Constantinople in the Eastern church which the bishop of Rome enjoyed in the Western.’” — GIESELER, Vol. I., page 269.

Concerning the popish claims that Peter was the first bishop of Rome, and that the keys committed to him had descended to them, it is asserted that “there is no historical proof whatever” that Peter was ever at Rome. “There is no mention in the New Testament that Peter ever was at Rome, and hence Scaliger, Salmasius, Spanheim, Adam Clark, and many other learned writers have denied that he ever visited that city. But supposing the Romish tradition to be true, that he suffered death at Rome, in company with the Apostle Paul, about A. D. 65, still there is no proof whatever that he was bishop of Rome, or that he had any particular connection with the church or churches in that city, any more than had Paul, or any other of the apostles. . . . Now, if Pope Peter was also at Rome, and more especially if he was there in the character of ‘supreme head of the church universal,’ is it not most astonishing that Paul should take not the slightest notice of him, and that neither the sacred Scriptures nor any of the apostolic fathers should say one word in relation to his connection with the church in that city?” — *History of Romanism*, page 45.

Further: “Supposing that it could be proved, which we have shown that it cannot, that Peter, during his life, was the supreme head of the church on earth, still it would be impossible to prove that this supremacy descended down from

one generation to another, through the long line of popes, many of whom, as we shall show, in the progress of this work, were monsters of vice and impurity; there is no evidence that the apostles had the slightest expectation of any such regular line of descent. The New Testament does not say a single word about it, and even the Roman bishops themselves did not make the claim to have derived their power from Peter till several centuries after the apostolic age."

FFS. "In the course of the sixth century, the city of Rome thrice witnessed the disgraceful spectacle of rival pontiffs, with fierce hatred, bloodshed, and massacre, contending with each other for the spiritual throne."

"During the last few years of the sixth century, the contest for supremacy between the bishops of Rome and Constantinople raged with greater acrimony than at any preceding period. The bishop of Constantinople not only claimed an unrivalled sovereignty over the Eastern churches, but also maintained that his church was in point of dignity no way inferior to that of Rome." — *Ibid.*, pages 48, 50, 51. HIS OF ROMANISM.

IN ACE Says Mosheim: "To enumerate the rights and institutions that were added in this century [the fifth] to the Christian worship would require a volume of considerable size."

By the beginning of the sixth century, "the Roman pontiff was constituted *judge in the place of God*, which he filled as the vicegerent of the Most High." — MOSHEIM, pages 396 and 443.

Under Constantine, in the year 325, church and state were in a manner united, and the Emperor became the chief director in both. The decline and transition were onward and rapid, until the ancient church was completely changed, disrobed of all her power and beauty, and obscured utterly in the dark wilderness of sin.

THE SUPREMACY OF ROMANISM. — THE POPES. — THE MIDNIGHT  
OF THE WORLD.

The Middle Ages, to which it is impossible to fix accurate limits, may be considered as embracing that dark and gloomy period of about a thousand years, extending from the fall of the Western empire of the Romans nearly to the close of the fifteenth century, at which point we detect the dawn of modern civilization, and enter upon the clearly marked outlines of modern history. "The history of Europe during several centuries after the overthrow of the Western Roman Empire offers little real instruction to repay the labor of wading through the intricate and bloody annals of a barbarous age. The fall of the Roman Empire had carried away with it ancient civilization." — WILSON'S *Outlines*, page 237.

"The period upon which we are now to enter," says Dowling, "comprising the ninth and tenth centuries, with the greater part of the eleventh, is the darkest in the annals of Christianity. It was a long night of almost universal darkness, ignorance, and superstition, with scarcely a ray of light to illuminate the gloom. This period has been appropriately designated by various historians as the 'Dark Ages,' the 'Iron Age,' the 'Leaden Age,' and the 'Midnight of the World.' . . . During these centuries it was rare for a layman, of whatever rank, to know how to sign his name; still more extraordinary was it to find one who had any tincture of learning. Even the clergy were for a long period not very superior as a body to the uninstructed laity. . . . In almost every council the ignorance of the clergy forms a subject for reproach, and by one council, held in 992, it is asserted that scarcely a single person was to be found in Rome itself who knew the first elements of letters. . . ." (HALLAM, page 460.) — *History of Romanism*, page 181.

THE TITLE OF "UNIVERSAL BISHOP" BESTOWED ON BONIFACE, BISHOP OF ROME, BY THE USURPER AND TYRANT PHOCAS, IN THE YEAR 605.

"Boniface, who succeeded to the Roman see in 605, . . . applied to the Emperor Phocas, a cruel and blood-thirsty tyrant, who had made his way to the throne by assassinating his predecessor, and earnestly solicited the title [of universal bishop], with the privilege of handing it down to his successors. The profligate Emperor, who had a secret grudge against the bishop of Constantinople, granted the request of Boniface, and after strictly forbidding the former prelate to use the title, conferred it upon the latter in the year 606, and declared the Church of Rome to be the head of all other churches.

"Henceforward the religion of Rome is properly styled POPERY, OR THE RELIGION OF THE POPE. Previous to the year 606 there was properly no POPE." — *History of Romanism*, page 55.

"The bestowment of the title of universal bishop by Phocas, the tyrant, upon Boniface III., bishop of Rome, *the first of the popes*, and the consequent establishment of papal supremacy, was the memorable event that embodied into a system and cemented into one the various false doctrines, corrupt practices, and vain and superstitious rites and ceremonies which had arisen in earlier ages, to deface the beauty and mar the simplicity of Christian worship. Before this event, the bishop of Rome had no power to enforce his decisions upon other churches and bishops." — *Ibid.*, page 57.

Says Marsh: —

"At length, in the commencement of the seventh century, the Emperor Phocas conferred upon Boniface III., bishop of Rome, the title of ecumenical, or universal, bishop. This title had been usurped by the bishop of Constantinople, but



it was now in this public manner taken from him and conferred upon the bishop of Rome ; and this, too, by one of the most odious tyrants that ever lived. . . . The world was sunk in Egyptian darkness. The cultivation of the human intellect was abandoned. . . . The great mass of the clergy were incapable of reading the Apostles' Creed." — MARSH, page 225.

"The priests and bishops were a most worthless, stupid, and corrupt race. They often passed their lives in the splendor of courts, or at the head of soldiers, and aspired to the honors of dukes, marquesses, and counts. Even the Roman pontiffs, with a few exceptions, were monsters of iniquity." — *Ibid.*, page 226.

THE POPE MADE A TEMPORAL PRINCE BY THE USURPER PEPIN ;  
A REIGN OF TYRANNY FOLLOWED.

"At the time of the Saracen invasion of France, Charles Martel, the guardian of the nominal sovereign, governed France, with the humble title of mayor, or duke. His son Pepin succeeded him, and during the minority of his royal ward, the imbecile Childeric III. wielded the power without assuming the name and honors of royalty ; but at length, in 752, he threw off the mask, obtained a decree of Pope Zachary in his favor, dethroned the last of the Merovingian kings, and caused himself to be crowned in the presence of the assembled nation, the first monarch of the Carlovingian dynasty. It was upon this occasion that the popes first exercised the authority of enthroning and dethroning kings.

"The word *pope* comes from the Greek word *papa*, and signifies *father*. In the early times of Christianity this appellation was given to all Christian priests ; but during many centuries past it has been appropriated to the bishop of Rome, whom the Roman Catholics look upon as the common

father of all Christians. During a long period after the introduction of Christianity into Rome, the bishops of Rome were merely fathers of the church, and possessed no temporal power. It was customary, however, to consult the pope in temporal matters; and the powerful Pepin found no difficulty in obtaining a papal decision in favor of dethroning the imbecile Childeric, and inducing the pope to come to Paris to officiate at his coronation. Soon after, in 755, Pepin invested the pope with the exarchate of Ravenna; and it is at this point — the union of temporal and spiritual jurisdiction — that the proper history of the papacy begins. Charlemagne and succeeding princes added other provinces to the papal government; but a long struggle for supremacy followed, between the popes and the German emperors; and under the pontificate of Gregory VII., towards the close of the eleventh century, the claims of the Roman pontiffs to supremacy over all the sovereigns of the earth were boldly asserted as the base of the political system of the papacy.” — WILSON’S *Outlines of History*, page 256.

“In the year 755 the pope became a temporal prince, ‘the little horn.’ For countenancing the dethronement of Childeric III., king of France, and crowning Pepin, Pepin gave to the Roman see the exarchate of Ravenna, Pentapolis, and twenty-one cities and castles. Charlemagne, his son and successor, aimed at the Empire of the West. He accomplished his purpose, went to Rome and was crowned; and in return for services, ceded to the papal see several cities and provinces, and gave it a subordinate jurisdiction over Rome and the annexed territory, enabling it to become the seat of wealth and magnificence. . . . The Man of Sin came in, as Paul said he would, ‘After the workings of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish.’ He arrogated to himself godlike titles and attributes, King

of Kings, Universal Father, Master of the World ; set himself above all laws, human and divine ; by taxes and massacres he oppressed and wore out the saints ; he changed ' times and laws,' appointing innumerable fasts and feasts, new modes of worship, and new articles of faith, and supporting himself by the most infamous frauds and barefaced pretensions to miracles. The most powerful monarchs were powerless before him. Emperors led his horse and held his stirrup. Kings were stripped by him of their honor and power, and whole realms were deprived of every religious privilege.

"For refusing to surrender to him the right of investure, the right ever claimed by the princes of Europe, of conferring the most important places in the churches and monasteries upon whom they pleased, by the ceremony of presenting the ring and crosier, Hildebrand, Gregory VII., a pope haughty and arrogant in the extreme, drove Henry, Emperor of Germany, from his throne, and compelled him, in the winter of 1077, to cross the Alps, and stand three days in the open air at the entrance of the pontiff's palace, with his feet bare, his head uncovered, and no other garment but a coarse woollen cloth thrown around his naked body, and implore forgiveness and a restoration to his dominions.

"For sanctioning, as was supposed, the violent death of Thomas à Becket, archbishop of Canterbury, a man who had acquired, by his pretended sanctity, a most amazing power, Henry II., king of England, was compelled by Pope Alexander to walk barefoot over three miles of flinty road, with only a coarse cloth over his shoulders, to the shrine of the murdered saint, where eighty monks, four bishops, abbots, and other clergy, who were present, whipped his bare back with a knotted cord, compelled him to drink water mingled with Becket's blood, and give forty pounds a year for tapers to burn perpetually before the martyr's tomb.

“ For opposing him in the appointment of an archbishop of Canterbury, Pope Innocent III., in the commencement of the thirteenth century, excommunicated John, king of England ; forbidding all persons to eat, drink, or converse with him, or do him service ; absolving all his subjects from his allegiance ; ordering the other monarchs of Europe to kill him, and laid the whole kingdom under an interdict, so that every religious privilege was taken away ; every church was shut ; no bell was heard ; no taper lighted ; no divine service performed ; no sacrament administered ; no priest was present, and no funeral solemnity was allowed in the burial of the dead ; and no place of interment was permitted but the highways.” — MARSH’S *Ecclesiastical History*, page 232.

#### TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

“ In the year 831, a monk named Paschasius Radbert advanced the strange sentiment that the bread and wine used in the Lord’s supper were, by consecration, converted into the body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, and was actually the same as was born of the Virgin Mary, as suffered on the cross, and was raised from the dead. . . . In 1215 it was declared by Innocent III. to be a doctrine whose belief is necessary to salvation. Thus was the doctrine of Transubstantiation introduced. . . . From this proceeded the thin wafer, which the Catholics use in the sacrament, that no part of the precious body of Christ may be lost, and the prohibition of the wine to the laity ; for if the bread is the real body of Christ, it contains his blood, and the wine is superfluous, and should not be wasted ; only it might be used by the priests, who need a double portion.” — *Ibid.*, page 236.

SUPERSTITION, FRAUD, AND FLAGRANT VICES PREVAIL UNDER  
THE DOMINION OF THE PAPACY.

“Wherever we turn our eyes among the various ranks and orders of the clergy, we perceive in this century [the twelfth] the most flagrant marks of licentiousness, fraud, ignorance, luxury, and other vices, whose pernicious effects were deeply felt, both in church and state.”—MOSHEIM, Vol. III., Part II., Chap. II., page 41.

Again:—

“When we consider the multitude of causes which united their influences in obscuring the lustre of genuine Christianity, and corrupting it by a profane mixture of the inventions of superstitious and designing men with its pure and sublime doctrines, it will appear surprising that the religion of Jesus was not totally extinguished. All orders contributed, though in different ways, to corrupt the native purity of true religion. The Roman pontiffs led the way; they would not suffer any doctrines that had the smallest tendency to diminish their despotic authority, but obliged the public teachers to interpret the precepts of Christianity in such a manner as to render them subservient to the support of papal dominion and tyranny. This order was so much the more terrible, in that such as refused to comply with it . . . were answered with the formidable arguments of fire and sword, and received death in the most cruel forms.”—*Ibid.*, Vol. II., Chap. III., Part I., page 81.

Under the reign of the universal ignorance of the times, “all of the various ranks and orders of the clergy had each their peculiar method of fleecing the people. The *bishops*, when they wanted money for their private pleasures or for the exigencies of the church, granted to their flock the power of purchasing remission of the penalties imposed upon transgressors, by a sum of money which was to be applied to

certain religious purposes ; or, in other words, they published *indulgences*, which became an inexhaustible source of opulence to the episcopal orders. The *abbots* and *monks*, who were not qualified to grant *indulgences*, had recourse to other methods of enriching their convents. They carried about the country the carcasses and relics of the saints in solemn procession, and permitted the multitude to behold, touch, and embrace these sacred and lucrative remains at certain fixed prices. The monastic orders gained often as much by this rover-show as the bishops did by their *indulgences*." — *Ibid.*, Vol. III., page 84.

"The history of the popes [in the beginning of the thirteenth century] presents a lively and horrible picture of the complicated crimes that dishonored the ministers of the church . . . The popes more especially inculcated that pernicious maxim, 'that the bishop of Rome is the supreme lord of the universe, and that neither princes nor bishops, civil governors nor ecclesiastical rulers, have any lawful power in church or state but what they derive from him.'" — *Ibid.*, Vol. III., Part II., Chap. II., page 165.

"It would be endless to enumerate the additions that were made in this century to the external part of divine worship, in order to increase its pomp and render it more striking." — *Ibid.*, Vol. III., page 260.

"To give a full account of all the operations, corruptions, superstitions, frauds, and enormities of the monks, their bitter animosities and contentions, would require volumes. Their history sickens the heart. To see men, under pretence of great devotedness to God, leading the most loathsome, filthy life ; sometimes casting off all clothing, and going on all-fours like beasts ; secreting themselves in dens and holes, or wandering about in the extremes of wretchedness, with their hair and beard of an enormous length, and their bodies covered with vermin ; eating, of choice, the most nauseous

food; wearing heavy chains; fastening grates upon their breasts and backs; girding themselves with bandages of bristles and sharp-pointed wires; flogging themselves with thorn sticks; mutilating their bodies, etc." — MARSH, page 219.

"The papacy attained its zenith in the thirteenth century. At that period the Romish system was fully developed. Innocent III., as the vicar of Christ, claimed for himself divine prerogatives. It was contended by the interpreters of canon law that the sentence of the pope, as the vicegerent of heaven, superseded all reasons and precluded every kind of appeal. Sacerdotal pretension rose to its highest pitch. Alexander Hales and Thomas Aquinas began to teach boldly that the priest could 'make the body of Christ' and 'act in the person of Christ.' The theory of transubstantiation, invented by the schoolmen, received formal sanction for the first time at the council of Lateran, in the year 1215. The celibacy of the priesthood now became an inviolable law. Separated as a distinct caste from ordinary society, the clerical body acted everywhere as the legionaries of the papal court. The network of ecclesiastical power was spread over all the nations of Christendom, bringing within its meshes people of every class and condition. The supremacy and independence of popedom, secured by the genius and indomitable energy of Hildebrand (Gregory VII.), and maintained by the craft and diligence of his successors, Boniface VIII. (1294–1303) resolved to make perpetual by the force of an unalterable decree. Circumstances seemed to favor his ambitious design. The powers of Europe at the time were wasting their resources in mutual strife. The sovereign pontiff seized with eagerness the occasion to accomplish his long-cherished purposes of aggrandizement.

"In the course of a long and desperate contest with Philip the Fair, for temporal as well as spiritual supremacy in the

kingdom of France, he issued, in November, 1302, the famous bull, entitled UNOM SANCTUM, in which he set forth the demands of the holy see in their most stringent form. 'The church,' he therein declares, 'is one body, and has one head. Under its command are two swords: the one to be used by the supreme pontiff himself; the other by kings and knights, by his license and at his will. But the lesser sword must be subject to the greater, and the temporal to the spiritual authority. *We declare that every human being must be subject to the see of Rome.* We assert, we define, and pronounce this to be an article of faith. . . .' For the distinct appeal to 'every man's conscience,' made by the apostles, was substituted the pagan principle of unreasoning coercion. Instead of the 'kingdom' which is 'not of this world,' we find a dominant hierarchy asserting its supremacy over every court in Europe, and exacting its claims by fire and sword. The law of Christ was set aside for a yoke of papal decrees and injunctions. The very idea of the church as a company of sincere Christian believers appears almost to have passed out of remembrance. . . . All traces of primitive purity were lost in the excesses of vice and in the perpetration of crimes that made the papal court a sink of abomination. . . . The supreme pontiff himself was not unfrequently the nominee of some ruthless demagogue, rude soldiers, ambitious prince, or daring woman, who expected to share the worldly advantages of his elevation. As the papal court rose in temporal greatness, it sunk in moral corruption.

"A century before the accession of Boniface VIII., when things were continually growing worse, Saint Bernard called attention to the enormities existing in the Romish Church. Writing to Innocent II., he says: 'There is but one voice among our faithful bishops, which declares that justice is vanishing from the church, and the power of the keys is gone; that episcopal authority is dwindling away; that a bishop



can no longer redress wrong nor chasten iniquity, however great, in his own diocese ; and the blame of all this they lay on you and on the Roman Court. The ambitious, the adulterous, the incestuous, and all such monsters of humanity, flock to Rome, in order either to obtain or keep ecclesiastical honors in the hands of the pope.' " — JOHN WADINGTON, D. D., on *Congregational History*, pages 1-4.

" During the whole course of this [the thirteenth] century the Roman pontiff carried on the most barbarous and inhuman persecution against those whom they branded with the denomination of heretics ; *i. e.*, against all those who called their pretended authority and jurisdiction in question, or taught doctrines different from those which were adopted and propagated by the Church of Rome.

" From this period [about 1235] we are to date the commencement of the dreadful tribunal of the *Inquisition*, which in this and the following ages subdued such a prodigious multitude of heretics, part of whom were converted to the church by terror, and the rest committed to the flames without mercy." Before this court were summoned " not only *heretics*, and *persons suspected of heresy*, but likewise all who were accused of *magic sorcery*, Judaism, witchcraft, and other crimes of that kind." — MOSHEIM, Vol. III., page 270.

About the beginning of the fourteenth century, during the quarrel between Boniface VIII. and Philip, king of France, the pope issued a *bull*, in which he " asserted that Jesus Christ had granted a twofold power to his church, or in other words, the *spiritual and temporal sword* ; that he had subjected the whole human race to the authority of the Roman pontiff, and that whoever dared to disbelieve it were to be deemed heretics, and stood excluded from all possibility of salvation." — *Ibid.*, Vol. III., page 313.

Of the fifteenth century, it is said that " the state of religion was become so corrupt among the Latins, that it was

utterly destitute of anything that could attract the esteem of the truly virtuous and judicious part of mankind. This is a fact which even they whose prejudices render them unwilling to acknowledge it, will never presume to deny. Among the Greeks and Orientals, religion had scarcely a better aspect. . . . The worship of the Deity consisted in a round of frivolous and insipid ceremonies. The discourses of those who instructed the people in public were not only destitute of sense, judgment, and spirit, but even of piety and devotion, and were in reality nothing more than a motley mixture of the grossest fictions and the most extravagant inventions." — *Ibid.*, Vol. III., page 445.

#### THE INQUISITION.

"But a still more terrible scourge, by which the saints were worn out and the dominion of the pope was maintained, was the Inquisition. This was established in the thirteenth century, and has continued a tremendous engine of power to this day. It was occasioned by the increase of heretics, as they were called, *i. e.*, of men who dared to think for themselves, call in question the power of the pope, and view him as the antichrist predicted by John. These were numerous in Gaul, and Innocent III. sent some legates, A. D. 1204, to extirpate them, root and branch. These bloodhounds, having Dominic at their head, were called inquisitors; and so serviceable were they found to the papal cause, that the pontiff established inquisitors in every city. A tremendous court was erected by them, first at Thoulouse, and afterwards in the various cities, embracing three inquisitors or judges, a fiscal proctor, two secretaries, a magistrate, a messenger, a reviewer, a jailer, an agent of confiscated possessions, several assessors, counsellors, executioners, physicians, surgeons, door-keepers, familiars, and visitors,

all of whom were sworn to secrecy. By this court, men were tried not only for heresy, or opposition to the Court of Rome, but for magic, sorcery, Judaism, and witchcraft, and either imprisoned for life or put to the most lingering and tormenting death." — MARSH, pages 233, 234.

"Fell superstition was increased by every art and device, until reason was lost, and the world raved in an awful mania. With the utmost hardihood, and a success which is altogether unaccountable, the pontiff and monks continually imposed upon the multitude, by presenting to them pretended relics of ancient saints; a skull, a finger, a jaw, a bone, or a tooth. They even held up to the admiring crowd the clothes in which Christ was wrapped in his infancy; pieces of the manger in which he was laid, of the cross on which he was hung, of the spear which pierced his side, of the bread which he broke at the last supper, yea, portions of the Virgin Mary's milk, and of the Saviour's blood." — *Ibid.*, page 236.

"For three centuries an incessant persecution raged against them. All the horrors of the *Inquisition* were employed for their subjection. Armies were raised and sent to terrify them into submission or utterly extirpate them. By the axe, by fire, the sword, and other shocking barbarities they were hurried into eternity. In France alone, above a million were slain for their adherence to the truth. In Germany and Flanders, too, they were persecuted with peculiar severity. The monks were urged by the popes to treat them worse than they treated the Saracens. In the castle of Menerbe, on the frontiers of Spain, one hundred and forty persons of both sexes were burnt alive. Persecutions often drove the Waldenses to the top of the Alps in the dead of winter, where they perished. One hundred and eighty infants were, at one time, found dead there in their cradles. Four hundred little children were suffocated in a cave in the

valley of Soyse, where they had been placed for safety." — *Ibid.*, page 246.

The Dominican and Franciscan orders commenced in the year 1207. Dominic, "Saint Dominic," the Roman Catholics call him, was the first "inquisitor-general." In one day, by his order, "fourscore persons were beheaded, and four hundred burnt alive in his sight."

The twelfth general council, and the fourth of Lateran, was held at Rome, in 1215. Pope Innocent III. presiding. This council issued a decree against all "heretics." The edict begins: "WE EXCOMMUNICATE AND ANATHEMATIZE EVERY HERESY EXTOLLING ITSELF AGAINST THIS HOLY, ORTHODOX, CATHOLIC FAITH WHICH WE BEFORE EXPOUNDED, condemning all heretics, by what names soever called. And being condemned, let them be left to the secular power, or to their bailiffs, to be punished by due animadversion. And let the secular powers be warned and induced, and if need be *condemned* by ecclesiastical censure, what offices soever they are in, that as they desire to be reputed and taken for believers, so they publicly TAKE AN OATH FOR THE DEFENCE OF THE FAITH, THAT THEY WILL STUDY IN GOOD EARNEST TO EXTERMINATE, TO THEIR UTMOST POWER, FROM THE LANDS SUBJECT TO THEIR JURISDICTION, ALL HERETICS DENOTED BY THE CHURCH," etc. — *History of Romanism*, page 32.

"In July, 1209, the crusading army arrived under the walls of Beziers, in three bodies." The last living creature was massacred; not one left to breathe. The city was then set on fire and consumed; not a house being left. Sixty thousand perished as "heretics."

It is said that "of all the inventions of popish cruelty, the *holy Inquisition* is the masterpiece." Every instrument of torture possible to conceive of was used as a means of punishment and destruction of all those denominated "heretics." The officers of the Inquisition were called "*familiars*." At

"the dead of night," perhaps, "a knock is heard at the door." Some one answers, "Who is there?" "*The holy Inquisition.*" A boy or girl, or father or mother, or child is demanded, and hastened away to death. "The commonest mode of torture to force the victims to confess or to accuse themselves were, *dislocation*, by means of pulley, rope, and weights; *roasting the soles of the feet*, and suffocation by water, with the torment of tightened ropes. These tortures were inflicted in a sad and gloomy apartment called the 'Hall of Torture,' situated far under-ground, in order that the shrieks of anguish generally forced from the miserable sufferers might not interrupt the death-like silence that reigned through the rest of the building."

"The next scene in this melancholy tragedy is the *auto da fé*. This horrid and tremendous spectacle is always represented on the Sabbath day." This was applied to the great burning of heretics. They were marched from their gloomy cells in "procession to the place of burning." "If the prisoner, on being asked, says he will die in the Catholic faith, he has the privilege of being strangled first, and then burnt; but if in the Protestant or any other faith different from the Catholic, he must be roasted alive." "When all is ready, fire is applied to the immense pile, and the suffering martyrs, who have been securely fastened to their stakes, are roasted alive; the living flesh of the lower extremities being often burnt and crisped by the action of the flames, driven hither and thither by the wind, before the vital parts are touched."

"It was not uncommon for the popish kings and queens of Spain to witness these wholesale burnings of heretics from a magnificent stage and canopy erected for the purpose, and was represented by the Jesuit priests as an act highly meritorious in the king to supply a fagot for the pile upon which the heretics were to be consumed. . . . King Charles II., in

an *auto da fé*, supplied a fagot, the sticks of which were gilded, adorned by flowers, and tied up with ribbons, and was honored by being the first fagot placed upon the pile of burning." In 1560 the following account was written by a Catholic to his friend from the town of Montalto concerning one of these horrible slaughters: "Most illustrious Sir, — Having written you from time to time what has been done here in the affair of heresy, I have now to inform you of the dreadful *justice* which began to be executed on these Lutherans early this morning, being the 11th of June. And, to tell you the truth, I can compare it to nothing but the slaughter of so many sheep. They were all shut up in one house as in a sheepfold. The executioner went, and bringing out one of them, covered his face with a napkin, or *benda*, as we call it, led him to a field near the house, and, causing him to kneel down, cut his throat with a knife. Then, taking off the bloody napkin, he went and brought out another, whom he put to death after the same manner. In this way the whole number, amounting to eighty-eight men, were butchered. I leave you to figure to yourself the lamentable spectacle, for I can scarcely refrain from tears while I write; nor was there any person who, after witnessing the execution of one, could stand to look on a second. . . . I still shudder while I think of the executioner with his bloody knife in his teeth, the dripping napkin in his hand, and his arms besmeared with gore, going to the house and taking out one victim after another, just as the butcher does the sheep which he means to kill." — *History of Romanism*, pages 567, 568, 569, 574, 576, and 582.

"Of all the institutions ever known to the world, or ever invented by human ingenuity, it [the Inquisition] was the most cruel, oppressive, and blood-thirsty. Its thousands of victims, whose bones were crushed with its accursed instruments of torture, and whose groans made its priestly officials

laugh with joy akin to that of the fiends of hell, still cry out of their tombs against it." — *Romanism and the Republic*, page 107.

"And this Inquisition, somewhat modified, was made use of in the city of Rome until 1870. Here religious toleration was unknown. No Protestants whatever were allowed to hold any service within the walls of Rome, so long as the pope had power. Punishment, imprisonment, and death were inflicted by the pope, and under his express sanction and authority." — *Ibid.*, page 110.

#### INDULGENCES.

"According to the doctrine of the Romish Church, all the good works of the saints, over and above those necessary toward their own justification, are deposited, together with the infinite merits of Jesus Christ, in one inexhaustible treasury. The keys of this were committed to St. Peter, and to his successors, the popes, who may open it at pleasure; and by transferring a portion of this superabundant merit to any particular person for a sum of money, may convey to him either the pardon of his own sins, or a release for any one in whom he is interested from the pains of purgatory. Such indulgences were first invented in the eleventh century, by Urban II., as a recompense for those who went in person upon the glorious enterprise of conquering the Holy Land. They were afterwards granted to those who hired a soldier for that purpose; and in process of time were bestowed on such as gave money for accomplishing any pious work enjoined by the pope. . . . Pope Leo X., in order to carry on the magnificent structure of St. Peter's, at Rome, published indulgences, and a plenary remission to all such as should contribute money toward it. Finding the project take, he granted to Albert, elector of Mentz and archbishop of Mag-

deburg, the benefit of the indulgences of Saxony and the neighboring parts, and farmed out those of other countries to the highest bidders ; who, to make the best of their bargain, procured the ablest preachers to cry up the value of the ware. The form of these indulgences was as follows : ‘ May our Lord Jesus Christ have mercy upon thee, and absolve thee by the merits of his most holy passion. And I, by his authority, that of his blessed apostles, Peter and Paul, and of the most holy pope, granted and committed to me in these parts, do absolve thee : first, from all ecclesiastical censures, in whatever manner they have been incurred ; then from all thy sins, transgressions, and excesses, how enormous soever they may be, even from such as are reserved for the cognizance of the holy see ; and so far as the keys of the holy church extend, I remit to you all punishment which you deserve in purgatory on their account ; and I restore you to the holy sacraments of the church, to the unity of the faithful, and to that innocence and purity which you possessed at baptism ; so that when you die, the gates of punishment shall be shut, and the gates of the paradise of delight shall be opened ; and if you shall not die at present, this grace shall remain in full force when you are at the point of death. In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.’ According to a book called the ‘Tax of the Sacred Roman Chancery,’ in which are contained the exact sums to be levied for the pardon of each particular sin, we find some of the facts to be thus : —

	s.	d.
“ For procuring abortion . . . . .	7	6
simony . . . . .	10	6
sacrilege . . . . .	10	6
taking a false oath in a criminal case . . . . .	9	6
robbing . . . . .	12	0
burning a neighbor’s house . . . . .	12	0



	s.	d.
For defiling a virgin . . . . .	9	0
lying with a mother, sister, etc. . . . .	7	6
murdering a layman . . . . .	7	6
keeping a concubine . . . . .	10	6
laying violent hands on a clergyman . . . . .	10	6

And so on." — BUCK's *Theological Dictionary*, page 191.

John Tetzel was one of the most zealous and successful pedlers of these indulgences. It was said of him, "It would have been hard to find in all the cloisters of Germany a man more adapted to the traffic with which he was charged." "In 1507, he gained in two days at Freyburg two thousand florins." In addressing audiences, in order to move them to purchase his pardons, he delivered the following: —

"Indulgences," said he, "are the most precious and sublime of God's gifts. This cross [pointing to the red cross] has as much efficacy as the cross of Jesus Christ. Draw near and I will give you letters duly sealed, by which even the sins you shall hereafter desire to commit shall be all forgiven you. I would not exchange my privileges for those of St. Peter in heaven, for I have saved more souls with my indulgences than he with his sermons. There is no sin so great that the indulgence cannot remit it, and even if any one should (which is doubtless impossible) ravish the Holy Virgin Mother of God, let him pay — let him only pay largely, and it shall be forgiven him. Even repentance is not indispensable. But more than all this: indulgences save not the living alone, they also save the dead. Ye priests, ye nobles, ye tradesmen, ye wives, ye maidens, and ye young men, hearken to your departed parents and friends, who cry to you from the bottomless abyss, 'We are enduring horrible torment! a small alms would deliver us; you can give it, and you will not.' . . . The very moment that the money chinks against the bottom of the chest, the soul escapes from pur-

gatory and flies free to heaven." — *History of the Reformation*, by D'AUBIGNE, page 68.

It was Tetzel's boldness and effrontery at selling indulgences that aroused the latent spirit and indignation of the famous Martin Luther at the beginning of the sixteenth century, and moved his great soul in opposition to this traffic.

Luther was born in 1483, was ordained a priest in 1507. In 1517, John Tetzel appeared in his neighborhood, selling indulgences. "To this office that bold Dominican inquisitor had been delegated by Albert, archbishop of Mentz, to whom the indulgences had been sent by Leo X.

"Had Tetzel been of a mild and timid spirit, the Reformation might have been delayed another century; but he was a man of uncommon boldness and impudence, just calculated to rouse the indignation of Luther. He was indeed a veteran in the traffic. Ten years before he had collected two thousand florins in the space of two days; and he boasted that by his indulgences he had saved more souls from hell than ever St. Peter converted by preaching. Said he, 'The moment the money tinkles in the chest, your father's soul mounts out of purgatory.'"—MARSH'S *Ecclesiastical History*, page 260.

The ground of proscription made by Roman Catholics against Swinton's "History" being used in Boston schools reads as follows:—

"When Leo X. came to the papal chair, he found the treasury of the church exhausted by the ambitious projects of his predecessors. He therefore had recourse to every means which ingenuity could devise for recruiting his exhausted finances, and among these he adopted an extensive sale of indulgences, which in former ages had been a source of large profits to the church." (Here is a star, referring to a foot-note.)

"The Dominican friars, having obtained a monopoly of

the sale in Germany, employed, as their agent, Tetzels, one of their own order, who carried on the traffic in a manner that was very offensive, and especially to the Augustinian friars."

The following is the foot-note:—

"These indulgences were, in the early ages of the church, remissions of the penances imposed upon persons whose sins had brought scandal upon the community. But in process of time they were represented as actual pardons of guilt, and the purchaser of indulgences was said to be delivered from all his sins."

Commenting on this, Edwin D. Mead, of Boston, a most conservative and fair-minded man, says: "If any fact in history stands avouched, it is that the most mechanical and venal interpretation of the doctrine of indulgence had become prevalent in the church in 1517, and that this was the immediate occasion of the Lutheran Reformation. The Roman Catholic Church for two centuries before that time had a bad record. It is a desire that that bad record shall be covered up, that it shall be kept as much as possible out of sight and out of remembrance,—this, and not any honest fear that teachers in our Boston schools will be telling their boys that Archbishop Williams or Leo XIII. issues licenses to commit sin,—which is the motive of the present Catholic opposition to Mr. Swinton's History." — *The Roman Catholic Church and the School Question*, page 26.

Again:—

"In 1522, when Germany was all ablaze with Lutherism, at the diet of Nuremberg, summoned to deal with Luther, this honest Dutch Pope Adrian declared roundly, through his legate, that 'these disorders had sprung up from the sins of men, more specifically from the sins of priests and prelates. Even in the holy chain,' said he, 'many horrible crimes have been committed. The contagious disease, spreading

from the head to the members, from the pope to the lesser prelates, has spread far and wide, so that scarcely any one is to be found who does right and is free from infection.'

"Pope Leo X. explained the doctrine of indulgences thus: 'The Roman Church, whom other churches are bound to follow as their mother, hath taught that the Roman pontiff,—the vicar of Jesus Christ upon earth, possessing the power of the keys, by which power all hindrances are removed out of the way of the faithful, that is to say, the guilt of actual sin, by the sacrament of penance, and the temporal punishment due for those sins, according to divine justice by ecclesiastical indulgence,—that the Roman pontiff may, for reasonable causes, by his apostolic authority, grant indulgences out of the superabundant merits of Christ and the saints to the faithful who are united to Christ by charity, as well for the living as for the dead; and that in thus dispensing the treasure of the merits of Jesus Christ and the saints, he either confers indulgences by absolution, or transfers it by the method of suffrage [that is, favor]; wherefore, all persons, whether living or dead, who really obtain any indulgence of this kind, are delivered from so much temporal punishment due, according to divine justice, for their actual sins, as equivalent to the value of indulgences bestowed and received.'" — *Romanism and the Republic*, page 196.

As stated by Mr. Mead, there is evidently a disposition upon the part of the Roman Catholics to keep in the background or out of sight the obnoxious features of their faith as it is known in their history, and parade something else. But the men who confronted Romanism at the beginning of the Reformation evidently knew what they were contending against. Said Wycliffe: "There is no greater heresy for a man than to believe that he is absolved from sin if he give money, or because a priest layeth his hand upon his head and saith, 'I absolve thee'; *for thou must be sorrowful in*

*thy heart, else God does not absolve thee.* . . . They chatter on the subject of grace as if it were a thing to be bought and sold like an ass or an ox; by so doing they learn to make a merchandise of selling pardons, the devil having availed himself of an error in the schools to introduce after this manner heresies in morals." These words of Wycliffe would have no meaning if this "selling of pardons" were not rife all about him.

"Said Luther: 'They say that indulgences, applied to the soul that suffers in purgatory, are imparted to it, and accounted for in the remission of the sins for which it should still suffer.' 'If you have anything to spare,' he says again, 'give it, in the Lord's name, for the building of St. Peter's at Rome, but do not *purchase pardons*.' 'I complain bitterly,' he wrote to the archbishop, 'of the fatal errors in which these men are involving the common people, men of weak understanding, whom, foolish as they are, these men persuade that they will be sure of salvation if they only buy their letters of plenary indulgence. They believe that souls will fly out of purgatory the moment that the money paid for their redemption is thrown into the preacher's bag, and that such virtue belongs to these indulgences that there is no sin which the indulgences will not absolutely and at once efface.'" — *The Roman Catholic Church and the School Question*, by EDWIN D. MEAD, pages 16, 18, 21.

In 1487, Pope Innocent issued a bull against the Waldenses and other heretics, and authorized Albert de Capitaneis, archdeacon of the church of Cremona, to act in concert with Inquisitor-General Blasius, "*to crush them like venomous asps*, and to contribute all their care to *so holy* and so necessary an extermination. . . . We give you power to have the crusade preached up by fit men; to grant that such persons as shall enter on the crusade and fight against these same heretics, and shall *contribute* to it, may gain

*plenary indulgence and remission of all their sins* once in life, and *also at their death*; to command, in virtue of their holy obedience, and under penalty of excommunication, all preachers of God's word to *animate* and *incite* the same believers to *exterminate* the *pestilence*, without sparing, by force of arms. We further give you power to absolve those who enter on the crusade, fight, or contribute to it, from all sentences, censures, and ecclesiastical penalties, general or particular, by which they may be bound . . . to concede to each, permission to *lawfully seize on the property*, real or personal, of heretics, etc."—*History of Romanism*, page 425.

Further :—

“In the downward progress of pontifical impurity, we have at length reached the lowest step, the utmost limits which have been assigned to papal and to human depravity ‘The ecclesiastical records of fifteen centuries,’ says Waddington, ‘through which our long journey is now nearly ended, contain no name so loathsome, no crimes so foul as his. [Roderic Borgia, Pope Alexander VI.] . . . In early life, during the pontificate of Pius II., Roderic Borgia, already a cardinal, had been stigmatized by a public censure for his unmuffled debaucheries. Afterwards he publicly cohabited with a Roman matron named Vanozia, by whom he had five acknowledged children. Neither in his manners nor his language did he affect any regard for morality or decency; and one of the earliest acts of his pontificate was to celebrate, with scandalous magnificence, in his own palace, the marriage of his daughter Lucretia. On one occasion, this prodigy of vice gave a splendid entertainment, within the walls of the Vatican, to no less than fifty prostitutes at once, and in the presence of his daughter Lucretia, at which entertainment deeds of darkness were done over which decency must throw a veil; and yet this monster of vice was, according to papists, the legitimate successor of the

apostles, and the vicar of God upon earth, and was addressed by the title of HIS HOLINESS! Again I ask, is not that apostate church, of which for eleven years this Pope Alexander VI. was the crowned and anointed head, and a necessary link in the chain of pretended apostolic succession, — is she not fitly described by the pen of inspiration, **MOTHER OF HARLOTS, AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH'?**” — *Ibid.*, page 427.

#### THE FAMOUS JUBILEE.

“About the conclusion of this [the thirteenth] century, Boniface the VIII. added to the public rites and ceremonies of the church the famous jubilee, which is still celebrated at Rome at a stated period, with the utmost profusion and pomp and magnificence.” This service consisted in making a pilgrimage to Rome and visiting the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul. The pope “enacted it as a solemn law of the church, that those who every hundredth or jubilee year confessed their sins, and visited, with sentiments of contrition and repentance, the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul at Rome, should obtain thereby the entire remission of their various offences. Finding that this increased the revenues of the Roman Church, they rendered its return more frequent, and fixed its celebration to every five and twentieth year.” — MOSHEIM, Vol. II., Chap. IV., Part II., page 264.

“About 1260 arose the Flagellants, or worshippers, a fanatical multitude of both sexes and all ranks and ages, who, encouraged by the mendicant orders, ran through the cities and villages, with whips in their hands, lashing their naked bodies, to appease the Deity, and, strange as it may appear to us, were greatly revered.” — MARSH, page 218.

Says Gladstone: “Rome does not keep good faith with

history as it is handed down in her own annals." (*Vaticanism*, page 129.) — *Romanism and the Republic*, page 204.

"If the liberties of the American people are ever destroyed, it will be by the hands of the Roman clergy." — The MARQUIS DE LA FAYETTE, *Ibid.*, page 36.

#### THE ROSARY.

"The *rosary* of the Virgin was probably invented in the tenth century. This is a string of beads, consisting of one hundred and fifty, which makes so many *Aves*, or *hail Marys*, every ten beads being divided by one something larger, which signifies a *pater*, or Lord's Prayer. Before repeating the rosary, it is necessary for the person to take it and cross himself, and then to repeat the creed, after which he repeats a prayer to the Virgin for every small bead, and a prayer to God for every large one." — *History of Romanism*, page 189.

"In 855, it is said, a woman, disguised as a man, had the art to gain an election to the papal chair, and governed the church for two years. She is known by the title of Pope Joan. . . . John XII. first introduced the practice in 956, followed by all his successors, of changing their name when chosen to the papacy." — MARSH, pages 241, 242.

THE ARROGANT CLAIMS OF THE PAPAL CHURCH, HER INTOLERANT AND HAUGHTY SPIRIT AND PRETENSIONS, AND TERRIBLE VICIOUSNESS TOWARDS ALL WHO WILL NOT RECOGNIZE HER AUTHORITY; HER CRAFT AND DECEPTIONS.

"The many-tongued Catholic masses, imbued with Romanist doctrines, and invested by that polity as by the shirt of Nessus, with the pope at their head, constitute living Romanism, aggressive, imperious, and relentless as ever.



“This vast power, besides assuming and exercising the most blasphemous religious prerogatives for more than a thousand years, has dispensed crowns and dethroned kings, absolved peoples from allegiance to their rightful sovereigns, or sanctioned their bondage under tyrants, according to its own pleasure and caprice; nor has it ever formally or impliedly abandoned any of its enormous pretensions. There is not a people in the Old World whose peace it has not disturbed, whose rulers it has not embroiled, the administration of whose government it has not embarrassed, whose rights it has not usurped, and whose soil it has not drenched in blood.” (LEROY M. VERNON.)—*Romanism and the Republic*, page 3.

“The Canon Law, the undisputed fundamental code of Romanism, reads as follows:—

“‘I. All human power is from evil, and must therefore be standing under the pope.

“‘II. The temporal powers must act unconditionally, in accordance with the spiritual.

“‘III. The church is empowered to grant, or take away, any temporal possession.

“‘IV. The pope has the right to give countries and nations which are non-Catholic to Catholic regents, who can reduce them to slavery.

“‘V. The pope can make slaves of those Christian subjects whose prince or ruling power is interdicted by the pope.

“‘VI. The laws of the church, concerning the liberty of the church and the papal power, are based upon divine inspiration.

“‘VII. The church has the right to practise the unconditional censure of books.

“‘VIII. The pope has the right to annul state laws, treaties, constitutions, etc.; to absolve from obedience thereto, as soon as they seem detrimental to the rights of the church, or those of the clergy.

“IX. The pope possesses the right of admonishing, and, if needs be, of punishing the temporal rulers, emperors, and kings, as well as drawing before the spiritual forum any case in which a mortal sin occurs.

“X. Without the consent of the pope, no tax or rate of any kind can be levied upon a clergyman, or upon any church whatsoever.

“XI. The pope has the right to absolve from oaths and obedience to the persons and the laws of the princes whom he excommunicates.

“XII. The pope can annul all legal relations of those in ban, especially their marriages.

“XIII. The pope can release from every obligation, oath, vow, either before or after being made.

“XIV. The execution of papal commands for the persecution of heretics causes the remission of sins.

“XV. He who kills one that is excommunicated is no murderer in a legal sense.” (DR. G. F. VON SCHULTE, Professor of Canonical Law at Prague). — *Ibid.*, page 6.

“The following paragraphs from the *Syllabus* of Pius IX., issued Dec. 8, 1864, and subsequently by the decree of infallibility confirmed as truths eternal, and equal in authority to the Decalogue, are samples of Roman Catholic toleration, viz.: ‘The state has not the right to leave every man free to profess and embrace whatever religion he shall deem true.

“It has not the right to enact that the ecclesiastical power shall require the permission of the civil power in order to the exercise of its authority.

“It has not the right to treat as an excess of power, or as usurping the rights of princes, anything that the Roman pontiffs or ecumenical councils have done.

“It has not the right to adopt the conclusions of a national church council, unless confirmed by the pope.

“ ‘It has not the right of establishing a national church separate from the pope.

“ ‘It has not the right to the entire direction of public schools.

“ ‘It has not the right to assist subjects who wish to abandon monasteries or convents.’

“ Then in the same *Syllabus* the rights and powers of the church are affirmed thus, viz. : —

“ ‘She has the right to require the state not to leave every man free to profess his own religion.

“ ‘She has the right to exercise her power, without the permission or consent of the state.

“ ‘She has the right to prevent the foundation of any national church, not subject to the authority of the Roman pontiff.

“ ‘She has the right to deprive the civil authority of the entire government of public schools.

“ ‘She has the right of perpetuating the union of church and state.

“ ‘She has the right to require that the Catholic shall be the only religion of the state, to the exclusion of all others.

“ ‘She has the right to prevent the state from granting the public exercise of their own worship to persons immigrating into it.

“ ‘She has the power of requiring the state not to permit free expression of opinion.’ ” — *Ibid.*, pages 6, 7.

“ The pope demands for himself the right to determine the province of his own rights, and has so defined it in formal documents as to warrant any and every invasion of the civil sphere. . . . Rome requires a convert who joins her to forfeit his moral and mental freedom, and place his loyalty and civil duty at the mercy of another.” — GLADSTONE, *Our Country*, page 51.

“ This pope, this foreigner, this Italian, is more powerful

in this country than any other person, not excepting even the king. And now please to consider what this foreigner has announced as the programme by which he rules in Prussia as elsewhere. He begins by arrogating to himself the right to define how far his authority extends; and this pope, who would use fire and sword against us if he had the power to do so, who would confiscate our property and not spare our lives, expects us to allow him full, uncontrolled sway in our midst." — PRINCE BISMARCK, *Ibid.*, pages 51, 52.

"The beginning of the sixteenth century saw the Roman Catholic Church predominant over all religious, civil, and social life throughout Europe. The holy Roman Empire, with its Emperor, was in subjection to the pope of Rome." — *Romanism and the Republic*, page 41.

"All, both pastors and faithful, are bound to submit, not only in matters belonging to faith and morals, but also in those pertaining to the discipline and government of the church throughout the world. This is the teaching of the Catholic faith, from which none can deviate, without detriment to faith and salvation. We further teach and declare that the pope is the supreme judge of the faithful, and that in all cases pertaining to ecclesiastical jurisdiction, recourse may be had to his judgment; and that none may rebate the judgment of the apostolic see, than whose there is no greater authority, and that it is not lawful for any one to sit in judgment on its judgment." — *Ibid.*, page 66. *Vatican Decrees*, page 52.

Says the *Catholic World*, for August, 1871: "We have no right to ask reasons of the church [the pope], any more than of Almighty God, as a preliminary to our submission. We are to take with unquestionable docility whatever instructions the church [pope] gives us." — *Ibid.*, page 67.

"No temporal prince, whether emperor, or king, or president, or any legislative body, can have any lawful jurisdic-

tion over the pope. What right has the pope to be independent of every civil ruler? He has it in virtue of his dignity as the vicar of Christ. Christ himself is King of kings, but the pope governs the church in the name of Christ, and as his representative. His divine office, therefore, makes him superior to every political, temporal, and human government." (Tract No. 46 of the Catholic Publication Society.) — *Ibid.*, page 68.

"Pius IX., who in 1880 declared absolutely null and void all the acts of the government of Piedmont, which he held prejudicial to the rights of religion, in the same year, because Spain had passed a law which permitted the toleration of non-Roman worship, and the secularization of ecclesiastical property, he declared, by his own apostolic authority, those laws to be abrogated, totally null, and of no effect." (GLADSTONE, *Vaticanism*, page 176.) — *Ibid.*, page 70.

"Here, then, is the indictment which we frame against this most arrogant and tyrannical of rulers. A pontiff claiming infallibility, who has condemned free speech, free writing, a free press, toleration of non-conformity, liberty of conscience, the study of civil and philosophical matters in independence of ecclesiastical authority, marriage, unless contracted in the Romish Church, the definition by the state of the civil rights of the church, — who has demanded therefore the title to define its own civil rights, together with a divine right to civil immunities and a right to use physical force, and who has also proudly asserted that the popes of the Middle Ages, with their councils, did not invade the rights of princes, etc." (GLADSTONE, *Vaticanism*, page 56.) — *Ibid.*, page 71.

"Nationalities must be subordinate to religion, and we must learn that we are Catholics first and citizens next. God is above man, and the church is above the state." (BISHOP GILMORE, in his Lenten letter of March, 1873.) — *Our Country*, by REV. J. STRONG, D. D., page 52.

“In a sermon preached when he was archbishop, Cardinal Manning put the following sentences in the mouth of the pope: ‘I acknowledge no civil power; I am the subject of no prince; and I claim more than this: I claim to be the supreme judge and director of the conscience of men; of the peasant that tills the fields, and of the prince that sits upon the throne; of the household that lives in the shade of privacy, and the legislator that makes laws for the kingdoms; I am the sole, last, supreme judge of what is right and wrong. . . . Moreover, I declare, affirm, define, and pronounce it to be necessary to salvation for every human creature to be subject to the Roman pontiff.’

“Cardinal Bellarmie says: ‘If the pope should err by enjoining vices or forbidding virtues, *the church would be obliged to believe vices to be good and virtues bad*, unless it would sin against conscience.’” — *Ibid.*, page 53.

#### WHAT THEY ARE AIMING AT.

“Father Hecker says that ‘ere long there is to be a state religion in this country [United States], and that state religion is to be Roman Catholic. The man to-day is living who will see a majority of the people of the American Continent Roman Catholics. (Boston *Pilot*.)’” — *Ibid.*, page 55.

The writer, having marshalled an array of evidence and citations reflecting upon the Roman Catholic hierarchy, showing its spirit, assumptions, and purpose, closes with the following indictment against that church: “I indict the pope of Rome as the representative of the papal policy, the representative whom they put forward to stand for the whole church in its antagonisms to religious and civil freedom, against which he has committed high crimes and misdemeanors.

“I impeach him in the name of liberty of conscience, whose rights he has denied; I impeach him in the name of freedom

of worship, whose temples he would close; I impeach him in the name of a free press and free speech, whose voice he would smother in the smoke of fire and fagot; I impeach him in the name of civil liberty, over whose just laws he has proclaimed the sovereignty of Romish councils; I impeach him in the name of the marriage bond of the majority of the happy households of the Christian world, which he has stigmatized as 'filthy concubinage,' because not contracted in the Romish Church; I impeach him in the name of Protestantism, which he calls 'heresy' and against which he invokes the persecution of the civil government and the tortures of the Inquisition. In the name of progress, which he has tried in vain to stay; of modern civilization, with which he cannot be reconciled; in the name of free and enlightened governments of the world, against whose most beneficent laws he has hurled his anathemas; in the name of the holy Bible, whose free circulation he has pronounced a pest; in the name of free America, whose overthrow he has plotted; in the name of Almighty God, whose prerogatives he has blasphemously usurped; in the name of all of these, I impeach the pope and the hierarchy which dominate the Roman Catholic Church, and summon them to the bar of oppressed humanity and of divine justice."—*Romanism and the Republic*, page 86.

Further: "In an encyclical, the pope says: 'The Romish Church has a right to exercise its authority without any limits set to it by the civil power; the pope and the priests ought to have dominion over temporal affairs; the Romish Church and her ecclesiastics have a right to immunity from civil law; in case of conflict between ecclesiastical and civil powers, the ecclesiastical powers ought to prevail.'" — *STRONG'S Our Country*, page 50.

"To what extent may the Roman Catholic Church coerce? How does the pope, how do the cardinals and archbishops

of to-day understand this term, as they use it? We know what they meant by coercion in the past. We know in the relation of the Huguenots, the Waldenses, Albigenses, and the Lollards, what coercion has meant with the Romish Church. We know what the Inquisition meant by coercion, — death by torture, by fire, by sword and axe, by starvation, by burying alive; and these have been the sanctioned methods of the Romish Church, never repudiated.”—*Romanism and the Republic*, page 106.

Said Pope Pius IX.: “We have been truly shocked at this most crafty device [Bible societies] by which the very foundations of religion are undermined. We have deliberated upon the means proper to adopt by our pontifical authority, in order to remedy and abolish *this pestilence*, as far as possible, *this* defilement of the faith, so imminently dangerous to souls.”—*Ibid.*, page 112.

#### AN AWFUL DENUNCIATION AND CURSING BY THE POPE.

The following exhibits the heart and soul of the Romish hierarchy, and the vicious spirit it harbors towards those not of her communion. This terrible cursing is pronounced upon the head of Victor Emmanuel, king of united Italy. This is the utterance of “Our Lord God, the Pope,” “The Divine Majesty,” “Prince of God,” “Priest of the World”:—

“By authority of the Almighty God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and of the Holy Canons, and of the undefiled Virgin Mary, mother and nurse of our Saviour; and of the celestial virtues, angels, archangels, thrones, dominions, powers, cherubim and seraphim; and of all the holy patriarchs and prophets; and of the apostles and evangelists; and of the holy innocents, who, in the sight of the Holy Lamb, are found worthy to sing the new song; and of the holy martyrs and holy confessors, and of the holy vir-



gins, and of the saints, together with all the holy and elect of God: we excommunicate and anathematize him, and from the threshold of the holy church of God Almighty we sequester him, that he may be tormented in eternal excruciating sufferings, together with Dathan and Abiram, and those who say to the Lord God, 'Depart from us; we desire none of thy ways.' And as fire is quenched by water, so let the light of him be put out forever more. May the Son who suffered for us, curse him. May the Father who created man, curse him. May the Holy Ghost which was given to us in our baptism, curse him. May the Holy Cross which Christ, for our salvation, triumphing over his enemies, ascended, curse him. May the Holy and eternal Virgin Mary, mother of God, curse him. May St. Michael, the advocate of holy souls, curse him. May all the angels and arch-angels, principalities and powers, and all the heavenly armies, curse him. May St. John the precursor, and St. Peter, and St. Paul, and St. John the Baptist, and St. Andrew, and all other Christ's apostles, together curse him; and may the rest of his disciples and four Evangelists, who by their preaching converted the universal world, and may the holy and wonderful company of martyrs and confessors, who by their holy work are found pleading to God Almighty, curse him. May the choir of holy virgins, who for the honor of Christ have despised the things of this world, damn him. May all the saints who, from the beginning of the world and everlasting ages, are found to be beloved of God, damn him. May the heavens and the earth, and all things remaining therein, damn him.

“May he be damned wherever he may be; whether in the house or in the field, whether in the highway or in the by-way, whether in the wood or water, or whether in the church. May he be cursed in living and dying, in eating and drinking, in fasting and thirsting, in slumbering and sleeping, in

watching or walking, in standing or sitting, in lying down or walking *mengendo concando*, and in all blood-letting. May he be cursed in all the faculties of his body. May he be cursed inwardly and outwardly. May he be cursed in his hair. May he be cursed in his brain. May he be cursed in the crown of his head and in his temples. In his forehead and in his ears. In his eyebrows and in his cheeks. In his jawbones and in his nostrils. In his foreteeth and in his grinders. In his lips and in his throat. In his shoulders and in his wrists. In his arms, his hands, and in his fingers. May he be damned in his mouth, in his breast, in his heart, and in all the *viscera* of his body. May he be damned in his veins and in his groin; in his thighs, in his lips, and in his knees; in his legs, feet, and toenails.

“May he be cursed in all the joints and articulations of his body. From the top of his head to the sole of his foot may there be no soundness in him. May the Son of the living God, with all the glory of his majesty, curse him; and may heaven, with all the powers that move therein, rise up against him, curse him and damn him! Amen. So let it be! Amen.” — *Ibid.*, pages 116, 117, and 118.

“The distinguished statesman of Spain, Castelar, speaking of the arrogance of the Roman Catholic Church in 1869, said to the Spanish Cortes: “There is not a single progressive principle which has not been cursed by the Catholic Church. This is true of England and Germany, as well as of Catholic countries. The church cursed the French Revolution, the Belgium constitution, and the Italian independence. Nevertheless all these principles have unrolled themselves in spite of it. Not a constitution has been born, not a single progress made, not a solitary reform effected, which has not been under the terrible anathemas of the church.” — *Ibid.*, page 122.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM IS OPPRESSIVE, TYRANNICAL, AND ENSLAVES PEOPLE. — HOLDS THAT “IGNORANCE IS THE MOTHER OF DEVOTION,” AND IS A NECESSITY.

Concerning the intent and purpose of the Roman Catholic Church, the following from the pen of Brownson, one of their oracles, speaks for itself: “The people need governing, and must be governed. They must have a master. The religion which is to answer our purpose must be above the people, and able to command them. The first lesson of a child is to obey; the first and last lesson to the people, individually and collectively, is obey. There is no obedience where there is no authority to enjoin it. The Roman Catholic religion, then, is necessary to sustain popular liberty, because popular liberty can be sustained only by a religion free from popular control, above the people, speaking from above and able to command them, and such a religion is the Roman Catholic. *In this sense we wish this country to come under the power of Rome.* As the visible head of the church, the spiritual authority which Almighty God has instituted to teach and govern the nation, we assert his supremacy, and tell our countrymen that we would have them submit to him. They may flare up as much as they please, and write as many alarming and abusive editorials as they choose, or can find time and space to do. They will not move us, or relieve themselves from the obligation Almighty God has placed them under of obeying the authority of the Catholic Church, pope and all.” — *Ibid.*, page 129.

#### ROMAN CATHOLIC VIEWS OF AN OATH.

“The Fourth General Lateran Council, with the approval of Pope Alexander III., decreed that an oath in opposition to the welfare of the church and the enactments of the holy fathers is not to be called an oath, but rather

perjury. Peter Deus, the great commentator of the laws and morality and theology of the church, lays it down as the law of the church, that the right of the pope, as the ultimate superior and sovereign, is reserved in every oath, which, of course, includes the oath of allegiance. He also instructs the faithful that the pope has the power of withdrawing or prohibiting what is included in an oath; and that, when he does so, it is no longer included." — *Ibid.*, page 134.

"Monsignor Capel, a very distinguished Roman Catholic, while stopping in the city of New York, in reply to the question, in an interview by Mr. H. A. Crous, 'Whom must we obey, if the state should command the citizen to do one thing, and the church should command him to do another?' Monsignor Capel replied, 'Then he must obey the church, of course.'" — *Ibid.*, page 163.

"A culprit or a witness, questioned by a judge, but in an illegal manner, may swear that he knows nothing of the crime about which he is questioned, although he knows it well, meaning mentally, that he knows nothing, in such a manner as to answer. . . . When a crime is well concealed, the witness, and even the criminal, may, and even must, swear that the crime has never been committed. The guilty party may yet do likewise when a half proof cannot be brought against him. . . . Signori asks whether a woman, accused of the crime of adultery, which she has really committed, may deny it under oath. He answers, 'Yes, provided she has been to confess, and receive absolution; for then,' he says, 'the sin has been pardoned, and has really ceased to exist. . . . As for an oath, made for a good and legitimate object, it seems there should be no power capable of annulling it. However, when it is for the good of the public, a matter which comes under the immediate jurisdiction of the pope, who has the supreme power over

the church, the pope has full power to release from that oath.' (SIGNORI, in *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, Chap. XIII.) It has undoubtedly become the settled law of the Roman Church that the pope may dispense with any promissory oaths, by withdrawing the promise or prohibiting its performance. . . . They are not to be called oaths, but rather perjury, which are in apposition to the welfare of the church and the enactment of the Holy Fathers." — *Deus, Papacy and Civil Power*, note to page 560. .

#### PAPAL SUPREMACY MEANS THE MOST ABSOLUTE DICTATION.

"In Italy, as late as 1865, not a Bible could be sold; not a voice could be heard preaching Christ on any part of Italian soil. The punishment for such an offence was imprisonment or death. The few friends of freedom, sometimes in caves, sometimes in woods, were accustomed, in fear and trembling, to meet and pray. The dungeons of the Inquisition were full. The stories of their horrors are too dreadful to be told here. The testimonies of De Sanctis and Gavozzi and others, which cannot be impeached, open before us damp, dark dungeons, where men and women were starved to death; the horrible vats where they were put alive into quick-lime to perish for their faith; the secret trap-doors through which they were dropped, where their cries could not be heard, and their protests were unknown." — *Romanism and the Republic*, page 141.

#### IT IS THE INTENT OF ROMANISM TO DESTROY THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS, EVEN OF AMERICA.

"Says the papal encyclical: 'The Romish Church has the right to interfere in the discipline of the public schools, and the arrangement of studies of public schools, and in the choice of teachers of these schools. Public schools, open to all children for the education of the young, should be under

the control of the Romish Church, and should not be subject to the civil power, nor made to conform to the opinions of the age.' (Encyclical XLV. and XLVII.)"—*Ibid.*, page 156.

Says the Rev. Dr. Toebbe, bishop of Covington: "The public schools are infidel and godless, and must therefore be avoided."

" ' Catholics would not be satisfied with the public schools, even if the Protestant Bible and every vestige of religious teaching were banished from them. They will not be taxed either for educating the children of Protestants or having their own children educated in schools under Protestant control.' (Boston *Advertiser*.)"—*Ibid.*, pages 159, 161.

"The *Catholic World*, of July, 1870, gives this interesting information: 'The supremacy asserted for the church in matters of education implies the additional and cognate functions of the censorship of ideas, and the right to examine and approve, or disapprove, all books, publications, writings, and utterances intended for public instruction, enlightenment, or entertainment, and the supervision of places of amusement.'"—*Ibid.*, page 162.

" ' We determine and decree that hard by every church, where it does not already exist, a parochial school is to be erected within two years of the promulgation of this council [January 6, 1886], and to be kept up in the future, unless the bishop sees fit to grant a further delay on account of more than ordinary grave difficulties to be overcome in its establishment.' (*Baltimore Council*.)

" ' Let the public school system go to where it came from — the devil.' (*Freeman's Journal*, Nov. 20, 1869.)"—*Ibid.*, pages 168, 173.

#### THE POPES DENOUNCE LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE.

"When in this country we speak of liberty of conscience, we mean that every man shall be permitted to worship God

as his own personal convictions of duty shall dictate. But the papal hierarchy have no such meaning, and intend nothing of the sort. With them, liberty of conscience merely consists in the right to embrace, profess, and practise the Catholic religion in a Protestant country, and not the right to embrace, profess, and practise the Protestant religion in a Roman Catholic country. Protestantism cannot be tolerated or compromised without sin, and must be exterminated." (*The Papacy and the Civil Power*, page 35.) — *Ibid.*, page 186.

#### THE CHARACTER OF THE POPES.

"Can Romanism appeal to history for sanction of papal infallibility? Shall I have time to tell you of the monsters of iniquity some of these popes were? But the Roman Catholic hierarchs of the middle and succeeding ages exhibited a melancholy change. Their lives displayed all the variations of impiety, malevolence, inhumanity, ambition, debauchery, gluttony, sensuality, deism, and atheism. Gregory the Great seems to have led the way in the career of villany. This well-known pontiff has been characterized as worse than his predecessors, and better than his successors, or, in other terms, as the last good and first bad pope. The flood-gates of moral dissolution appeared, in the tenth century, to have been set wide open, and inundations of impurity poured on the Christian world through the channel of the Roman Catholic hierarchs.

"Awful and melancholy indeed is the picture of the popedom at this era, drawn as it has been by its warmest friends, Platina, Petavius, Suitprand, Genebrard, Baronius, Hermann, Barclay, Binius, Grannone, Vignier, Labbe, and Du Piu." (EDGAR'S *Variations of Popery*, pages 108, 109.) — *Ibid.*, page 209.

"On two separate occasions there were three popes. Now,

which of these three was pope, when all three claimed to be? They were all cursing, — if that is any mark of, a pope, — every man of them anathematizing and denouncing the others. At that time, known as the great schism, occurring from and after 1378, there was a period of seventy years in which there was a pope at Avignon, over in France, and a pope in Rome, and they surely did not hold each other in good estimation. There were seventy years in which the air was blue with their mutual anathemas, and the apostolic succession was wholly unsettled. Now, you will remember that these popes were all infallible. I affirm to you that, by the authority of Roman Catholic historians, many of these popes were guilty of the most infamous crimes, and that the councils of the Roman Catholic Church itself have characterized many of the popes in language so dreadful that it is hardly fit to be read before any audience. . . .

“The sacred Synod of Constance, in the twelfth session, convicted His Holiness of schism, heresy, incorrigibleness, simony, impiety, immodesty, unchastity, fornication, adultery, incest, rape, piracy, lying, robbery, murder, perjury, and infidelity. This was John XXIII., pope of Rome; and that is what the council of Constance said of him, the very same council that burned John Huss and Jerome of Prague.” — *Ibid.*, page 207.

Others of the popes were charged with similar crimes, and convicted. The popes would have similar imputations against the councils. But the Roman Catholics have a sedative that fortifies against all of this degeneracy and violence, and in their opinion the keys of St. Peter are transmitted unsullied through all this fearful line of iniquity. Says Peter Fredet, D. D., a Catholic writer: “It is true, a few among them gave great scandal to the Christian world in their private character and conduct; but it ought to be remembered, at the same time, that, through a special protec-



*tion of Divine Providence, the irregularity of their lives did not interfere with their public duty, from which they never departed. The beneficial influence of sacred jurisdiction does not depend on the private virtue of the persons invested with it, but on their divine mission and appointment to feed the Christian flock. Nor did Christ promise personal sanctity to its chief pastors, but gave to them authority to teach and govern the faithful.* — *Ibid.*, pages 212, 213.

Here we have it. 'The man may be a great sinner, but the pope is pure and holy. This is Roman Catholic theology.

#### THE ROMAN CATHOLIC IDEA OF EDUCATION.

"The *Catholic World* for April, 1871, gives the Roman Catholic idea of education as follows: —

" ' Education is the American hobby ; regarded, as uneducated or poorly educated people usually regard it, as a sort of panacea for all the ills that flesh is heir to. We ourselves, as Catholics, are, as decidedly as any other class of American citizens, in favor of universal education, as thorough and extensive as possible — *if the quality suits us*. We do not indeed prize as highly as some of our countrymen appear to do the ability to read, write, and cipher. *Some men are born to be leaders, and the rest are born to be led.* . . . The best ordered and administered state is that *in which the few are well educated and lead, and the many are trained to obedience, are willing to be directed, content to follow, and do not aspire to be leaders*. In extending education, and endeavoring to train all to be leaders, we have only extended presumption, pretension, conceit, indocility, and brought incapacity to the surface. *We believe that the peasantry in old Catholic countries, two centuries ago, were better educated, although for the most part unable to read and write, than are the great body of the American people to-day.*' . . . That is Roman Catholic

education. Do you say this is only my statement of it? No ; it is their own. And do you want it emphasized? Look at Italy, and France, and Spain, and Portugal, and Austria, and Mexico, and South America, if you desire illustrations. What is their idea of education? The few to be taught and lead, the many to do what tyrants have made their subjects do through all the years of this suffering world's history, — to grind in their prison-houses for the enrichment of despots." — *Ibid.*, page 234.

There is a vast difference between this idea of education and that system that makes it possible for the poor boy, the farmer, tailor, tanner, the shoemaker, the carpenter, indeed, all classes of workmen, to secure an education and rise to the highest stations in life, by industry and skill, that is adopted by the American people. That is, to teach every man all that he is capable of receiving.

Roman Catholics urge that the schools should be under the direction of the priests. Monks and nuns are the preferred teachers.

Says Mr. Lansing : " I noticed in one of our papers in this city yesterday or the day before, a list of the professors in the Roman Catholic College of the Holy Cross in this city [Worcester, Mass.] for the ensuing year. Every one of those gentlemen had after his name the letters S. J. What does it mean? Society of Jesus — Jesuits."

*Here is the oath that all Jesuits take :* " I do renounce and disown any allegiance as due to any heretical king, prince or state named Protestant, or obedience to any of their inferior magistrates or officers. I do further declare, that the doctrine of the Church of England, the Calvinists, Huguenots, and others of the name of Protestants, to be damnable ; and they themselves are damned, and to be damned, that will not forsake the same. I do further declare that I will help, assist, and advise all or any of His Holiness's agents in

any place wherever I shall be, in England, Scotland, or in any other territory or kingdom I shall come to; and do my utmost to extirpate the heretical Protestants' doctrine, and to destroy all their pretended powers, legal or otherwise. I do further promise and declare that, notwithstanding I am dispensed with to assume any religion heretical, for the propagating of the Mother Church's interests, to keep secret and private all her agents' councils from time to time, as they intrust me, and not to divulge, directly or indirectly, by word, writing, or circumstance whatsoever, but to execute all that shall be proposed," etc.

"These are the preferred teachers of the Roman Catholic Church. Those who have denounced everything, political, religious, and educational, except that which is associated with the interests of Rome. Here is what is found in a textbook, entitled 'Familiar Explanation of Christian Doctrine, adapted for the family and more advanced students in Catholic schools and colleges,' published in 1875, by Kreuzer Brothers, Baltimore, and sanctioned by Archbishop Bayley. Lesson XII. is called 'No salvation outside of the the Roman Catholic Church.' The questions and answers run thus (this is what they want to use instead of Swinton's History): 'Q. Since the Roman Catholic Church alone is the true church of Jesus Christ, can any one who is outside of the church be saved? A. He cannot. — Q. Did Jesus Christ himself assure us most solemnly, and in plain words, that no one can be saved out of the Roman Catholic Church? A. He did, when he said to his apostles, "Go and teach all nations," etc. — Q. What do the fathers of the church say about the salvation of those who die out of the Roman Catholic Church? A. They all, without any exception, pronounce them infallibly lost forever. — Q. Are there any other reasons to show that heretics, or Protestants, who die out of the Roman Catholic Church, are not saved? A. There are

several. They cannot be saved because (1) they have no divine faith; (2) they make a liar of Jesus Christ, of the Holy Ghost, and of the apostles; (3) they have no faith in Christ; (4) they fell away from the true church of Christ; (5) they cannot perform any good works whereby they can obtain heaven; (6) they do not receive the body and blood of Christ; (7) they die in their sins; (8) they ridicule and blaspheme the mother of God and his saints; (9) they slander the spouse of Jesus Christ, the Catholic Church.' Again, on page 97: 'Q. Now do you think that God, the Father, will admit into heaven those who make liars of his Son, Jesus Christ, of the Holy Ghost, and the apostles? A. No; he will let them have their portion with Lucifer in hell, who first rebelled against Christ, and who is the father of liars. — Q. Have Protestants any faith in Christ? A. They never had. — Q. Why not? A. Because there never lived such a Christ as they imagine and believe in. — Q. In what kind of a Christ do they believe in? A. In such a one of whom they can make a liar, etc. — Q. Will such a faith in such a Christ save Protestants? A. No sensible man will assert such an absurdity. — Q. What will Christ say to them on the day of judgment? A. "I know you not, because you never knew me." ' Again, page 104: 'Q. Are Protestants willing to confess their sins to a Catholic bishop, or priest, who alone has power from Christ to forgive sins? A. No; for they generally have an utter aversion to confession, and therefore their sins will not be forgiven throughout all eternity. — Q. What follows from this? A. That they will die in their sins, and are damned.' " — *Ibid.*, pages 240, 241.

This is the teaching of Archbishop Bayley.

" 'When I was a little boy, in Canada, at school,' says a converted Catholic in this city, 'we were encouraged in dislike of our Protestant fellow-pupils, so that we thought it

right to throw missiles at them, and abuse them, and often they went bleeding from the encounter, having committed no offence against us, only they were Protestants.'” — *Ibid.*, page 242.

Protestants might learn a very profitable lesson from the above, and cultivate the virtues of toleration, civility, and Christian graces toward each other and the Catholics.

“ William Hogan, who was for many years a priest in the Roman Catholic Church, says, on page 172 of his book, which he wrote after he became a distinguished lawyer in the Southern United States: ‘ I pronounce all Roman Catholic priests, bishops, popes, monks, friars, and nuns to be the most deliberate and wilful set of liars that ever infested this or any other country, or disgraced the name of religion. . . . I have asserted, and continue to assert, that there is not a Roman Catholic church, chapel, or house of worship in any Catholic country where indulgences are not sold. I will go even further, and say, that there is not a Roman Catholic priest, or inquisitor, who has denied the fact that he does not sell indulgences himself. And yet these priests and these bishops — these men of sin, falsehood, impiety, barbarity, and immorality — talk of morals, and preach morals, while in their lives and their practice they laugh at such ideas as morality.

“ ‘ I would ask all or any of them if they have ever heard mass in any Catholic church in Dublin, or any other city in Ireland, without hearing published from the altar a notice, in the following words: ‘ Take notice that there will be an indulgence on — day, in — church. Confessions will be heard on — day. Prepare, those who wish to partake of the indulgence.’ I have published hundreds of such notices myself, and any American who may visit Ireland, or any other Catholic country, and has the curiosity, may enter the Roman Catholic chapel and hear these notices read, and

when he returns to the United States he will hear the Roman Catholic priest say that there are no indulgences sold by the Romish Church.'” (HOGAN'S *Popery*, page 172.) — *Romanism and the Republic*, pages 265, 266.

#### MURDER.

“ ‘ A man who has been excommunicated by the pope may be killed anywhere, as Escobar and Deaux teach ; because the pope has an indirect jurisdiction over the whole world, even in temporal things, as all the Catholics maintain, and as Suarez proves against the king of England. . . . Pope Gregory VII. decided it was no murder to kill excommunicated persons.’ This is taken from the *London Times*, July 26, 1872, written by Lord Acton. Gregory says : ‘ This rule was incorporated in the canon law. . . . It appears in every reprint of the *Corpus Juris*. It has been for seven hundred years and continues to be part of the ecclesiastical law. Far from being a dead letter, it obtained a new application in the days of the Inquisition ; and one of the popes has declared that the murder of a Protestant is so good a deed that it atones, and more than atones, for the murder of a Catholic.’ They claim the right to murder all rulers whom they consider apostates ; and has it ever been brought to your attention (I speak of it as a curiosity only) that every person who had anything to do with the assassination of Abraham Lincoln was a Roman Catholic ? that John Wilkes Booth was a Roman Catholic ; Payne and Asterott ; also, Dr. Judd, who dressed his leg ; Garrett, on whose premises he was killed ; also, that Harold was a Roman Catholic ? Mrs. Surratt and her son were Roman Catholics ; in their house was the headquarters for Roman Catholics and Jesuit priests. All of this was brought out before the military tribunal which condemned some of them to death.” — *Ibid.*, pages 270, 271, 272.

## IMAGE WORSHIP.

“The Eighth General Council commands the adoration of images. The fatuous superstition of that age is perhaps more fitly illustrated by the third canon of the Eighth General Council, which was held in Constantinople, in 870 A. D. ‘We decree that the holy image of our Lord Jesus Christ, the liberator and Saviour of all men, shall be adored equally with the Book of the Holy Gospels. . . . For, as by uttering the syllables which are found written in that book, we all attain our eternal salvation, so also, by the operation of the imagination on the colors of the image we all, learned and unlearned, derive an equal advantage. Every one, therefore, who does not adore an image of our Saviour shall not behold himself when he comes in his glory, to be glorified with and to glorify all his saints; but such an one shall be debarred from all communion with him in his glory. The same rule applies to the image of Mary, his pure mother and the mother of God; so it does, also, to the images of the holy angels, and also to the images of the most praiseworthy apostles, and prophets, and martyrs, and holy men, and to the images of all the saints; we must honor and adore all those images also. And if one should omit to adore them all, let him be anathema from the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.’”—MONTAGU, page 224.

“Thomas Aquinas (St. Thomas) declares that the same service or worship has to be paid to both the person and to the image of the person; the same to the image of Christ as to Christ himself; the same to Mary and an image of Mary; the same to a saint and to the image of the saint. As Christ must be worshipped with supreme devotion, therefore an image of him must always be adored with supreme devotion. . . . We say that a cross is to be worshipped with the worship due to God; and for this reason we sup-

plicate a cross, and we pray to a cross, as if Christ himself, hanging on the cross, were before us.

“Many and many a time, in foreign lands, have I seen the poor people drop down in the presence of a cross by the roadside, or in a chapel, and embrace it as though they held the feet of Christ himself. . . . In the church of the Aracoeli at Rome, at the Capitoline Hill, there was formerly a bronze image of a she-wolf that was worshipped by the old Roman pagans; they have taken away the bronze image of the she-wolf, and have put in its stead one of the most hideous-looking wooden dolls that one ever beheld. That Bambino (the word means baby), as an object of worship, I have looked at while hundreds were thronging in and prostrating themselves before it. It is most carefully guarded by the priests of that church, as containing miraculous power.

“Among the images that I must mention, in order to give you a just idea of their prominence [in the Roman Catholic Church], let me remark on that in St. Peter’s, the image of Peter himself, under that grandest dome in the world, in a church the splendor of which exceeds anything your eyes ever rested on, — unless you have seen that itself, — on a high pedestal, higher than my breast, stands this bronze statue, larger than life, cast from the bronze that was formerly in an old Roman statue, now made to represent the Apostle Peter. This, also, is clothed with the pope’s robes once in a year; on its head is placed the triple crown, and on its finger the ring of the pope, and every day when that church is open (I think it is open every day in the year), the thronging multitudes crowd about the image and bow themselves down before it as if it were God. The bronze statue of Peter is worshipped devoutly by the peasants and lower population, who kneel along on the marble floor before it; then reverently approach to kiss the worn toe that records



the millions of kisses it has received. I saw a noble-looking priest, robed in white, his head as white as his dress, reverently approach this statue, carefully wipe the worn toe, kiss it, and press his forehead against it; kiss it a second time with tokens of awe and reverence, then retire as from the presence of a royal ruler." — *Ibid.*, pages 299, 300, 301, 303.

#### IMMACULATE CONCEPTION OF THE VIRGIN MARY.

"On the eighth day of December, 1854, Pope Pius IX. sat under the dome of St. Peter's, with a triple crown, blazing with jewels, on his head, and with the splendid apparel of the pope upon his shoulders. Around him knelt five hundred prelates and dignitaries of the church; before him were ten thousand of the faithful, and in the great square outside fully forty thousand more. As they solemnly waited in this presence, a cardinal arose, and advancing toward the pope, said slowly, 'Father, tell us if we shall believe and teach that the Virgin Mary was immaculate in her conception'; and the pope solemnly answered, 'We do not know. Let us inquire of the Holy Spirit.' And all joined to sing 'Come, Holy Spirit.' Then the cardinal again arose, and advancing as before, asked the same question; and the pope answered, 'We do not know now. Let us ask the Holy Spirit.' And once more the assembled thousands sang, 'Come, Holy Spirit.' When, for the third time, in all the pomp and magnificence of ceremony, the cardinal advanced, the pope answered to the question, 'Shall we believe and teach that the Virgin Mary was immaculate in her conception?' 'Yes, yes. The Virgin Mary was immaculate in her conception. So believe and teach. There is no salvation to those who deny this teaching' It was then proclaimed a dogma of the church." — *Ibid.*, page 321.

## THE VIRGIN MARY WORSHIPPED AS BEING DIVINE.

“In order to become the mother of God, the blessed Virgin Mary had to be raised *to an equality with the Trinity*, so to speak, *by being infinite in perfections and graces*, an equality which no creature ever obtained. . . . There is no grace comes from heaven to us, unless the Virgin Mary dispenses it to us. For this office she, and she alone, obtained of God from all eternity.” (ST. BERNARDINUS SENENSIS.)—*Ibid.*, page 326.

“In the city of Lisbon, Portugal, there is a church dedicated to Mary as a goddess, in the following words: ‘To the Virgin, goddess of Soretto, the Italian race devoted to her divinity, have dedicated this temple.’”—*Ibid.*, page 334.

“Pope Sixtus IV., who erected a triumphal arch on the bridge of St. Angelo, on which he called himself God, granted to those who prayed to the Virgin Mary an indulgence of one hundred thousand years.”

“The rosary of Mary,” says Dr. Barnum, in his book, “is the most popular of all the forms of Roman Catholic devotion. That rosary has on it fifteen beads, and every one of these has associated with it a special thought of prayer. These prayers are offered variously, with certain changes of form and manner, to the Holy Virgin Mary. . . . ‘It is the will of God that all graces should come to us by the hand of Mary.’ (SIGNORI, page 5.) ‘To reverence the Queen of Angels is to gain eternal life.’ (Page 8.) ‘All graces are dispensed by Mary; and all who are saved, are saved only by means of this Divine Mother.’” (Page 14.)—*Ibid.*, pages 337, 338.

## AURICULAR CONFESSION.

“Auricular means confession in the ear, and, of course, to a priest. The penitent is compelled to confess every

known thing, whether male or female. It leads to captivity and crime. A beautiful woman recites: 'When I went to the first [confessional] I was a spotless, stainless woman. He asked me those questions that poisoned and degraded my soul, and blackened my life. The sin that followed was only the natural consequence. I left him in the bitterness of my spirit, and went, after a year of sin, to another confessor, an old man. The same thing followed again,' etc. It is a source of humiliation and degradation, in which one voluntarily places himself in bondage to others. Absolution follows confession. When the penitent has confessed, the priest uses the following language: 'The passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, the merits of the blessed Mary, always virgin, and of all the saints, and whatever good you have done, and whatever evil you have suffered, be unto you for the remission of sins, the increase of grace, and the reward of eternal life. Amen.'"

#### PRIESTS TELL WHAT THEY HEAR IN THE CONFESSION.

"The following are the words of one who was himself a popish priest for some time. Referring to another priest, whom he occasionally met, he says: 'All our conversation ran upon the stories he heard in confession; but he is not the only person who is free in what he has heard, for it is the ordinary discourse of the priests, when they meet, to inform one another of what they have heard in confession. This I can assert, because I was often present at such conferences, where the conversation was so indecent that even an honest Pagan would have blushed.'

"De Sanctino says, after speaking of the character of the confessors: 'While the penitent arraigns his faults with all the fatuity of a simpleton, what is the confessor doing? Laughing at the simplicity of the penitent, and afterwards.

in the priestly orgies that follow a morning of great confessions, in the hilarity that flows from wine, amidst coarse explosions of laughter, they describe to each other the stupid folly of their penitents ; and each priest vies with his brother in rendering his own penitents more ridiculous than the rest. To such a degree is the individual debased and degraded by confession.” — *Ibid.*, pages 395, 397, 403, 414.

In the Catholic “Sunday-School Manual,” in use in Boston, a text-book for Catholic children, the following is found, which gives a correct idea of the early training of Roman Catholic children : —

#### CONFESSION.

“I confess to Almighty God, to the blessed Mary, ever virgin, to blessed Michael the archangel, to blessed John the Baptist, to the holy apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul, and to all the saints, that I have sinned exceedingly in thought, word, and deed, through my fault, through my fault, through my most grievous great fault. Therefore I beseech the blessed Mary, ever virgin, blessed Michael the archangel, blessed John the Baptist, the holy apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul, and all the saints to pray to the Lord, our God, for me. May the Almighty God have mercy on me, forgive me my sins, and bring me to everlasting life. Amen. May the Almighty and merciful Lord give me pardon, absolution, and remission of all my sins. Amen.” — *Sunday-School Manual*, page 7.

“Q. *What is confession?* A. Confession is the accusation of all our sins to a priest, in order to obtain absolution of them. — Q. *How must we declare our sins?* A. We must declare their number, their different species, and their considerable circumstances. — Q. *Must we declare them all?* A. Yes, we must declare all ; for if we were to conceal wil-

fully any mortal sin, we should not obtain the remission of any, and should, besides, commit a sacrilege. . . . Q. *In what sentiments should we place ourselves upon our knees before the priest, when we are going to confession?* A. In the sentiments of a criminal who is about to offer honorable amends to God, viewing Jesus Christ in the person of the priest. — Q. *How ought we to begin our confession?* A. Having made the sign of the cross, we should say, ‘Bless me, father, for I have sinned’; then recite the ‘I confess to Almighty God,’ etc. — Q. *What should we do next?* A. We should inform the priest when we confessed last, whether we then received absolution, and whether we complied with the penance enjoined. . . . Q. *What ought we to do whilst the priest is giving absolution?* A. We ought to renew our act of contrition with all the fervor we are capable of. Q. *What is absolution?* A. It is the remission of our sins, which the priest imparts in virtue of the power he has received from Christ. — Q. *Who are the priests that can exercise this power?* A. Those only who are approved of by the bishop.” — *Ibid.*, page 47.

## OF INDULGENCE.

“Q. *What is an indulgence?* A. An indulgence is the remission of the temporal punishment due to sin, either in this life or the life to come. — Q. *By what power does the church grant indulgences?* A. She grants them by the power she has received from Jesus Christ. — Q. *Which is the greatest indulgence?* A. It is the indulgence of the jubilee. — Q. *Can any one apply indulgences to the souls in purgatory?* A. Yes; they help them so much the more efficaciously, as these souls, being confirmed in grace, cannot offer any obstacle to them.” — *Ibid.*, page 50.

“Q. *Whither did the soul of our Saviour go after death?* A. His soul went down into that part of hell called Limbo.

— Q. *What do you mean by Limbo?* A. I mean a place of rest, where the souls of the saints were. — Q. *And are the souls in purgatory helped by our prayers?* A. Yes; they are. — Q. *What do you mean by purgatory?* A. A middle state of souls, suffering for a time on account of their sins. — Q. *In what cases do souls go to purgatory?* A. When they die in less sins, which we call venial; or when they have not satisfied the justice of God for former transgressions." — *Ibid.*, pages 18, 21, 22.

This abridged history and reference concerning the Roman Catholic Church, its rise, development, spirit, tenets, tradition, superstition, intolerance, tyranny, oppression, and arrogant assumption cannot fail to confirm unto the reader that that church answers fully to the predictions made by the apostles as constituting the "Man of Sin," the "Mother of Harlots," etc. It is the institution as such that we have to deal with. The early Protestant sects retained much of the spirit and notions of this mother.

After the establishment of the Church of England, — called the "Established Church," — all who did not conform to it were denominated dissenters, non-conformists, or sectarians. These were required by an act of Parliament to give proof of their conformity by subscribing to these words: "I, A B, do humbly confess and acknowledge that I have grievously offended God, in contemning her Majesty's lawful government and authority by absenting myself from church, and in using unlawful conventicles and assemblies and pretence and color of exercise of religion, and I am heartily sorry for the same; and I do acknowledge and testify in my conscience that no person hath, or ought to have, any power or authority over her Majesty; and I do promise that I will, from time to time, repair to the church and hear divine service, and do my utmost endeavor to defend and maintain the same." In case of disobedience, the offender was to "abjure the realm," or

be treated as a felon and "be hanged by the neck till he was dead." — COBBETT's *Legacy to Parsons*, page 62.

No wonder these dissenters, Independents, Baptists, Quakers, Puritans, fled to the New World to find a resting-place, and enjoy that freedom of person and conscience that nature and revelation bequeath to man. An American, born in this free land, where none dare question his right of liberty and conscience, can scarcely understand how such a condition of things could exist as the intolerance and persecuting spirit manifested by Roman Catholics towards Protestants, and Protestants towards each other. Chief among the things that ought to swell every American heart with gratitude to God is the blessing of freedom and liberty of person and conscience expressed by the grand old flag of the country, wherever it waves, to each and every citizen, whatever may be his religious proclivities. God bless our land, our flag, and our nation, that undimmed, unsullied, and unbroken they may be handed down to generations unborn as the richest legacy ever bequeathed to posterity, wrought out by the hand of God and the diligence of our fathers, and bestowed upon us. He is no proper Christian who is not a friend to such a country.

All conservative, thoughtful, and fair-minded men incline to lament over much that occurs in the pedigree of even Protestant churches, for the intolerance and unchristian demeanor manifest one towards another, rather than praise it. "We all of us, ladies and gentlemen" (says Mr. Mead), "have a rather mixed and impure religious pedigree; we have all, at times, I fear, been miserable sinners. Church of England people cannot be very proud of Henry VIII., of sundry proceedings on the part of Archbishop Whitgift, of the general moral condition of the church at the time of the Wesleyan revival, of the system of church 'livings,' of the fact that a lot of their bishops to-day derive large revenues

from the rents of grog-shops, of the perversions and extravagances of doctrines which have obtained and obtain to-day in large sections of the church. The New England Congregationalist is not proud of the dealings with the Quakers and Baptists and witches on the part of his ancestors, though his ancestors were no worse in this than other people at the time. The Boston Unitarian is not very proud, I take it, of the attitude of his father toward Emerson and Theodore Parker. But the Roman Catholic is haunted to a much greater extent than other people by the hobgoblin of consistency; his whole theory of his miraculously inspired and guided and shielded church compels an excessive anxiety to show a good record. But, ladies and gentlemen, the record is very streaked and speckled." — *The Roman Catholic Church and the School Question*, pages 26, 27.

The following is in relation to a dispensation being extended by Martin Luther and others to the Landgrave of Hesse, in granting him the privilege to marry a second wife while the first wife was still living. It is addressed, "*To the most serene prince and lord, Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, Count of Catzenburbogen, of Diets, of Ziegenhain and Nidda, our gracious lord, we wish above all things the grace of God through Jesus Christ.*"

"I. We have been informed by Bucer, and in the instructions which your Highness gave him have read the troubled mind and uneasiness of conscience your Highness is under at this present; and although it seemed to us very difficult so speedily to answer the doubts proposed, nevertheless, we could not permit the said Bucer, who was urgent for his return to your Highness, to go away without an answer in writing. . . ."

"III. Your Highness is not ignorant how great need our poor, miserable, little, and abandoned church stands in, of virtuous princes and rulers to protect her; and we doubt



not but God will always supply her with some such, although from time to time he threatens to deprive her of them, and proves her by sundry temptations.

“IV. These things seem to us of greatest importance; your Highness, sufficiently of yourself, comprehends the difference there is betwixt settling an universal law and using (for urgent reasons and with God’s permission) a dispensation in a particular case; for it is otherwise evident that no dispensation can take place against the first of all laws, the divine law.

“V. We cannot at present advise to introduce publicly, and establish as a law in the New Testament that of the Old, which permitted to have more wives than one. Your Highness is sensible, should any such thing be printed, that it would be taken for a precept, whence infinite troubles and scandals would arise. We beg your Highness to consider the dangers a man would be exposed unto, who should be convicted of having brought into Germany such a law, which would divide families and involve them in endless strifes and disturbances.

“VI. As to the objection that may be made, that what is just in God’s sight ought absolutely to be permitted, it must be answered in this manner: If that which is just before God, besides commanded and necessary, the objection is true; if it be neither necessary nor commanded, other circumstances, before it be permitted, must be attended to; and to come to the question in hand; God hath instituted marriage to be a society of two persons and no more, supposing Nature were not corrupted; and this is the sense of the text of Genesis, ‘There shall be two in one flesh,’ and this was observed at the beginning.”

“IX. In certain cases, however, there is room for dispensation. For example, if a married man, detained captive in a distant country, should there take a second wife, . . . we

see not how we could condemn, in these cases, such a man, . . . provided it was not with a design of introducing a new law, but with an eye only to his own particular necessities.

“X. Since, then, the introduction of a new law, and the using a dispensation with respect to the same law, are two very different things, we entreat your Highness to take what follows into consideration.

“In the first place, above all things, care must be taken that plurality of wives be not introduced into the world by way of law, for every man to follow as he thinks fit. In the second place, may it please your Highness to reflect on the dismal scandal which would not fail to happen if occasion be given to the enemies of the Gospel to exclaim that we are like the Anabaptists, who have several wives at once, and the Turks, who take as many wives as they are able to maintain.”

“XVI. We also beg your Highness not to entertain a notion that the use of women out of marriage is but a light and trifling fault, as the world is used to imagine; since God hath often chastised impurity with the most severe punishments.

“XVII. We have related these passages, to the end that your Highness may consider seriously that God looks not on the vice of impurity as a laughing matter, as is supposed by those audacious libertines who entertain heathenish notions on this object. We are pleased to find that your Highness is troubled with remorse of conscience for these disorders. . . .”

“XVIII. . . . And if your Highness, after marrying a second wife, were not to forsake those licentious disorders, the remedy proposed would be to no purpose. . . . Remember that God has given you a numerous issue of such beautiful children of both sexes by the princess, your wife, that you have reason to be satisfied therewith. How many others, in marriage, are obliged to the exercise and practice of patience

from the motive only of avoiding scandal. We are far from urging on your Highness to introduce so difficult a novelty into your family. . . .”

“XX. As to what your Highness says, that it is not possible for you to abstain from this impure life, we wish you were in a better state before God. . . .

“XXI. But after all, if your Highness is fully resolved to marry a second wife, we judge it ought to be done secretly, . . . that is, that none but the person you shall wed and a few trusty persons know of the matter, and they, too, obliged to secrecy under the seal of confession. Hence no contradiction nor scandal of moment is to be apprehended; for it is no extraordinary thing for princes to keep concubines; and though the vulgar should be scandalized thereat, the more intelligent would doubt of the truth, and prudent persons would approve of this moderate kind of life, preferable to adultery and other brutal actions. There is no need of being much concerned for what men will say, provided all goes right with conscience. So far we do approve it, and in those circumstances only by us specified; for the gospel hath neither recalled nor forbid what was permitted in the law of Moses with respect to marriage. . . .

“XXII. Your Highness hath therefore, in this writing, not only the approbation of us all, in case of necessity, concerning what you desire, but also the reflections we have made thereupon. . . .”

“XXIV. . . . May God preserve your Highness. We are most ready to serve your Highness. Given at Wittenberg, the Wednesday after the feast of St. Nicholas, 1539.”

Signed,

“MARTIN LUTHER.

MARTIN BUCER.

ADAM.

JUSTUS WINTFERTE.

PHILIP MELANCTHON.

ANTONY CORVIN.

JOHN SENINGUE.

DENIS MELANTHER.”

This writing was in Melancthon's handwriting, as attested by George Nuspicker, notary.

Then follows "The Marriage Contract of Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, with Margaret de Staal. *In the name of God, Amen.*

"Be it known to all those, as well in general as in particular, who shall see, hear, or read this public instrument, that in the year 1540, on Wednesday, . . . his Highness declares that his will is to wed the said Lady Margaret de Staal, although the princess, his wife, is still living, and that this action may not be imputed to inconstancy or curiosity, to avoid scandal and maintain the honor of said lady, and the reputation of her kindred, his Highness makes oath here before God, and upon his soul and conscience, that he takes her to wife through no levity nor curiosity, nor from any contempt of laws or superiors; but that he is obliged to it by such important, such inevitable, necessities of body and conscience, that it is impossible for him to save either body or soul without adding another wife to his first. . . . The same cause and the same necessity have obliged the most serene princess, Christia, Duchess of Saxony, his Highness's first lawful wife, out of her great prudence and sincere devotion for which she is so much to be commended, freely to consent and admit of a partner, to the end that the soul and body of her most dear spouse may run no further risk, and the glory of God increased, as the deed written with the princess's own hand sufficiently testifies. . . ." Signed, "Balthasor Rand, of Fuld, notary public imperial."—*History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches*, pages 205–218.

Those who desire many wives can get but little consolation from the above transaction, as a precedent. Neither does it give warrant to the sentiment, now current somewhat, that Luther favored the theory of having many wives. The document, taken as a whole, is rather against it. A vile prince,

the friend of Luther, compelled the granting to him, at the loss of his patronage, a dispensation to take another wife while his first was alive. This is the truth in the case. We have given extensive extracts from this long document on purpose to correct what appears to us a popular error. Honor to whom honor is due, should be the sentiment of every honest man.

## BAPTISM.

*Baptized* is from the Greek word *baptistheis*. It is not a translation, but is transferred, with an English termination. *Baptize* is from the Greek word *baptizo*, anglicized or Englishized, and means, when used in connection with the ordinance of baptism, *immersion*. Says Richard Fuller: "Never was there a word the meaning of which was more clear and precise." Again: "The question before us, then, is this: What does *baptizo* mean? I answer, it means *immerse*. It no more means to pour, or sprinkle, than it means to fly."

## EVIDENCE FROM GREEK WRITERS.

Heraclides Ponticus (*Allegor.*, page 495): "When a piece of iron is taken red-hot from the fire, and is dipped [original, *baptized*] in water, the heat, being quenched by the peculiar nature of the water, ceases."

The Greek Scholiast, on *Aratus*, Vol. V., page 951: "The crow often dips [*baptizes*] herself from the head to the top of the shoulders in the river."

Alcibiades, in *Jacob's Anthol.*, Vol. XI., page 49, note: "And I, plunging [*baptizing*] you in the waves of the sea, will destroy you in the briny surges."

Anacreon, in his ode on *Love in the Heart*: "Finding Cupid among the flowers, I caught him and plunged [*baptized*] him into wine, and drank him up."

"*Baptizo* always denotes a total immersion. If only a part of a thing be immersed, still it is an entire immersion of

that part, and the context limits its extent. Thus, Polybius, Vol. III., page 72: 'The foot-soldiers passed through [the waters] scarcely immersed [*baptized*] to the paps.' "

#### VIEWS OF EMINENT AUTHORS ON THIS SUBJECT.

"Luther: 'Baptism is a Greek word, and may be translated immersion, as when we immerse something in water, that it may be wholly covered. And although it is almost wholly abolished (for they do not wholly dip the children, but only pour a little water on them), they ought, nevertheless, to be wholly immersed, and then immediately drawn out; for that the etymology of the word seems to demand.' "

"Beza: 'Christ commanded us to be baptized; by which word, it is certain, immersion is signified. *Baptizesthai*, in this place, is more than *nipstein*; because that seems to respect the whole body, this only the hands. Nor does *baptizein* signify to wash, except by consequence; for it properly signifies to immerse for the sake of dyeing. To be baptized in water signifies no other than to be immersed in water, which is the external ceremony of baptism. *Baptizo* differs from the verb *dunai*, which signifies to plunge in the deep and to drown.' "

"Vitringa: 'The act of baptizing is the immersion of believers in water. This expresses the force of the word. Thus also it was performed by Christ and the apostles.' "

"Hospinianus: 'Christ commanded us to be baptized; by which word it is certain immersion is signified.' "

"Salmasius: 'Baptism is immersion, and was administered in former times, according to the force and meaning of that word.' "

"Brenner: 'The word [baptism] corresponds in signification with the German word *taufen*, to sink into the deep.' "

"Bretschneider: 'An entire immersion belongs to the

nature of baptism.' 'This is the meaning of the word.' 'In the words *baptizo* and *baptisma* is contained the idea of a complete immersion under water; at least, so is *baptisma* in the New Testament.'"

"Rheinard, *Ethics*, Vol. V. page 79: 'In sprinkling, the symbolical meaning of the ordinance is wholly lost.'"

"Scholtz, on Matt. iii. 6: '*Baptism* consists in the immersion of the whole body in water.'"

"Neander, in his *Letter to Judd*: 'As to your question on the original rite of baptism, there can be no doubt whatever that, in the primitive times, it was performed by immersion, to signify a complete immersion into the new principle of the divine life, which was to be imparted by the Messiah.'"  
— RICHARD FULLER'S *Spiritual Baptism*, pages 21, 23-27.

Again: "In commanding his disciples to be baptized, Jesus knew what act he enjoined, and he could have been at no loss for a word clearly to express his meaning. Did he intend *sprinkling*? the word was *rantizo*. Did he require *pouring*? the word was *keo*. If *wash*, *nipo*; if *bathe*, *lono*; if *immerse* or *dye* (the word having this latter meaning, because dyeing is by immersing), *bapto*. If Jesus meant *immerse*, and *nothing else*, the word was *baptize*. This is the word he has used, and which the Holy Spirit always employs when the rite of baptism is mentioned." — *Ibid.*, page 36.

"Josephus, who was contemporary with the apostles, says: 'Our vessel being sunk [baptized] in the midst of the Adriatic, we swam all night, until the break of day, when we discovered a vessel of Cyrene, and myself with certain others, to the number of eighty, were taken on board.'" (*Ant. of the Jews*, 9, 10, 2.) — *Ibid.*, page 39.

"In *The Jewish War*, II. 20, 1, he says: 'After Cestius was overthrown, many of the most eminent of the Jews swam away from the city as from a ship that is being sunk [baptized].' The same, III. 7, 5: 'I should esteem that pilot

to be an arrant coward, who, out of fear of storm, should sink [*baptize*] his vessel of his own accord.' The same, III. 10, 9, describing an engagement between the Jews and Romans, he says: 'If the Jews ventured to come near the Romans, they were sunk [baptized], together with the ships themselves.'" — *Ibid.*, page 40.

"Olshausen, Vol. II., page 101, says: 'John baptized at Enon, because there was deep water there, convenient for immersion.'" — *Ibid.*, page 77.

"Bloomfield: 'There is here [Rom. iv.] plainly a reference to the ancient mode of baptism by immersion; and I agree with Koppe and Rosenmüller, that there is reason to regret it should have been abandoned in most Christian churches, especially as it has so evident a reference to the mystic sense of baptism.'" — *Ibid.*, page 89.

"Epictetus (about A. D. 68), *Dissert.*, Vol. III, page 69, says: 'As you would not wish to sail in a large and finely ornamented vessel and be sunk [baptized], so neither would you choose to live in a large and richly furnished house and be in a storm.'" — *Ibid.*, page 41.

"Rosenmüller (on the passage): 'Immersion in the water of baptism, and coming forth out of it, was a symbol of a person's renouncing his former life, and, on the contrary, beginning a new one. On account of this emblematical meaning of baptism, the rite of immersion ought to have been retained in the Christian church.'" — *Ibid.*, page 89.

"Prof. Stuart says: 'Thirteen hundred years was baptism generally and ordinarily performed by the immersion of a man under water; and only in extraordinary cases was sprinkling or effusion permitted. These latter methods of baptism were called in question, and even prohibited.'" — *Ibid.*, page 109.



BAPTISM BY IMMERSION IN WATER FROM AN HISTORICAL  
STAND-POINT.

Vitringa : —

“The act of baptizing is the immersion of believers in water. This expresses the force of the word. Thus also it was performed by Christ and his apostles.” — *Aphor. Theol. Sanct. Aphoris*, 884.

Calvin : —

“Baptism resembles a legal instrument properly attested, by which He assures us that all our sins are cancelled, effaced, and obliterated, so that they will never appear in His sight, or come into His remembrance, or be imputed unto us. For He commands all who believe to be baptized *for the remission* of their sins. Therefore those who have imagined that baptism is nothing more than a mark or sign by which we profess our religion before men, as soldiers wear the insignia of their sovereign as a mark of their profession, have not considered the *principal thing* in baptism ; which is, that we ought to receive it with this promise, ‘He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.’” — *Inst.* 1, 4, 115, page 327.

John Wesley, in his comment on the New Testament, says : —

“Baptism administered to real penitents is both a *means* and a seal of pardon. Nor did God ordinarily in the primitive church bestow this [pardon] on any, unless through *this means*.” — Page 35.

Venema : —

“It is without controversy that baptism in the primitive church was administered by immersion into water, and not by sprinkling. The essential act of baptizing, in the *second* century, consisted, not in sprinkling, but in immersion in water, in the name of each person in the Trinity. Concern-

ing immersion, the words and phrases that are used sufficiently testify ; and that it was performed in a river, a pool, or a fountain. To the essential rite of baptism, in the *third* century, pertained immersion, and not aspersion, except in cases of necessity, and it was accounted a half-perfect baptism. Immersion, in the *fourth* century, was one of those acts that were considered as essential to baptism ; nevertheless, aspersion was used in the last moments of life, on such as were called clinics, and also, where there was not sufficient quantity of water." — *History Eccles. Secul.*, I. § 138, etc.

Bingham, in his *Antiquities*, says : —

"Baptism was administered by immersion ; and no mention is made of any other mode till the middle of the third century."

Mosheim says : —

"The sacrament of baptism was administered in this century without the public assemblies in places appointed and prepared for that purpose, and was performed by an immersion of the whole body in the baptismal font." — *First Century*, IV. 8.

Tertullian writes, in the second century : —

"We, after the example of Jesus Christ, are born in water. . . . The act of baptism itself is carnal, in that we are plunged in water ; but the effect is spiritual, in that we are freed from sins." — *On Baptism*, Chaps. I and VII.

Calvin, in his *Institutes*, says : —

"The word *baptizo* [baptize] signifies to immerse, and the rite of immersion was performed by the ancient church."

John Wesley, on Rom. vi. 4, says "that Paul in his text refers to immersion, which was the mode of baptism practised in the primitive church."

Salmasius, a French theological teacher in Germany, says in his work, page 669 : —

“Baptism is immersion, and was administered in former times according to the force and meaning of the word.”—*Sixteenth Century*.

Prof. Charles Anthon, of New York, said in a letter to Dr. E. Parmeley, March 27, 1843 :—

“The primary meaning of the word [baptizo] is to dip or immerse. . . . Sprinkling, etc., are entirely out of the question.”

Smith, in his *Dictionary of the Bible*, says :—

“Baptism properly and literally means immersion.”

#### INFANT BAPTISM.

“M. De la Roque : ‘The primitive church did not baptize infants ; and the learned Grotius proves it, in his annotations on the Gospel.’” — *Scriptural Baptism*, page 224.

“In the Roman Catholic *Manual of Controversy* we have the following question and answer :—

“Q. But why should not the Scripture alone be the rule of our faith, without having recourse to apostolical traditions?

“A. Because infant baptism and several other necessary articles are either not at all contained in Scripture, or at least, are not plain in Scripture, without the help of tradition.” — *Ibid.*, pages 223, 224.

“Starck, *History of Baptism*, page 11 : ‘There is not a single example to be found in the New Testament where infants were baptized. In household baptism, there was always reference to the gospels having been received. The New Testament presents just as good grounds for infant communion. Therefore, learned men (such as Salmasius, Arnold, Louis de Vives, Suicer, and W. Strabo) have regarded both infant baptism and infant communion as an innovation introduced since the apostolic times. The connection of infant baptism with circumcision deserves no con-

sideration, since there were physical reasons for circumcising in infancy.' " — *Ibid.*, page 208.

In regard to infant baptism, Luther says : —

" It cannot be proved by the sacred Scriptures that infant baptism was instituted by Christ, or begun by the first Christians after the apostles." \*

Chambers : —

" It appears that in the primitive times none were baptized but adults." †

Curcellæus : —

" The baptism of infants, in the first two centuries after Christ, was altogether unknown ; but in the third and fourth was allowed by some few. In the fifth, and following ages, it was generally received. The custom of baptizing infants did not begin before the *third* age after Christ was born. In the former ages no trace of it appears, and it was introduced without the command of Christ." ‡

Neander : —

" It cannot possibly be proved that infant baptism was practised in the apostolic age. Its late introduction, the opposition it met with in the second century, rather speak against an apostolic origin." §

#### LAYING ON OF HANDS FOR THE RECEIVING OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

Tertullian, A. D. 200 (*De Bapt.*, Chap. VI.) : —

" After baptism, the hand is imposed by blessing, and calling and inviting of the Holy Spirit, who willingly descends from the Father on the bodies that are cleansed and blessed."

Further upon this, in Chap. VIII., he says : —

\* In A. R.'s *Vanity of Infant Baptism*, Part II. page 8.

† *Cyclopædia*, art. Baptism.

‡ *Institut. Relig. Christ.*

§ *Apost. Age*, Vol. I., page 140.

"It is the fleshly or outward act of baptism that we are dipped in water; the spiritual effects that we are freed from our sins. Then follows laying on of hands, the dispenser inviting the Spirit of God by prayer; and, being cleansed by baptismal water, we are disposed for the Holy Spirit under the hands of the angel of the church."

Speaking concerning the order and state of the church at this early time, after the death of the apostles, he says (*De Script.*, Chap. XXXVI.) :—

"She believeth in God, she signs with water (that is, baptizeth), she clothes with the spirit (viz., by the imposition of hands), she feeds with the Eucharist (administers the emblems of the Lord's body), and exhorts to martyrdom (to faithfulness, and the keeping of the law of God even unto death), and against this order or institution she receives no man."

Eusebius, not the pope of that name, but Eusebius Pamphilus, who lived about three hundred years after Christ, in his work (Book VII., Chap. II.), certifies that :—

"The *ancient manner* of receiving members into the church was with prayer and the laying on of hands."

Again he says (Book VI., Chap. XXVI.) :—

"That one Novatius being sick was baptized, if it may be called a baptism which he received, for he obtained not after his recovery that which he should have done by the canon of the church, to wit, confirmation by the hands of the bishop, which having not obtained, how can he be supposed to have received the Holy Spirit?"

This was about the year 260.

With these I might also cite Mosheim's "Church History," Vol. I., page 91; and Gahan's "Church History," page 93.

Cyprian, in A. D. 250, and against whom none will bring an accusation, in his seventy-third letter, when referring

to the fact of the apostles going to Samaria to confirm those that Philip had baptized, says : —

“ Which custom is also descended to us, that they who are baptized might be brought by the rules of the church, and by prayer of imposition of hands to obtain the Holy Ghost.”

Again in Epistle 72 : —

“ It is of no purpose to lay hands on them to receive the Holy Spirit, unless they receive the baptism of the church.”

Augustine, of the fourth century, writes : —

“ Still we do what the apostles did, when they laid their hands on the Samaritans and called down the Holy Ghost upon them.”

Mosheim says, in his history : —

“ After baptism they by prayer and the laying on of hands were solemnly recommended to the mercy of God and dedicated to his service.” — *First Century*, Part II., Chap. IV., verse 13.

Cyprian, who lived in the third century, says : —

“ Those who have been dipped abroad outside the church and have been stained among heretics and schismatics, when they come to us and to the church ought to be baptized, for the reason that it is a small matter (that is, of no value) to lay hands on them that they may receive the Holy Ghost, unless they receive also the baptism of the church.” — *Epistle 71*.

Mosheim says : —

“ For many of the first Christians were no sooner baptized according to Christ's appointment, and dedicated to the service of God by solemn prayer and the imposition of hands, than they spoke in languages they had never known or learned before ; foretold future events, healed the sick by pronouncing the name of Jesus, restored the dead to life, and performed many things above the reach of human power.” — *First Century*, Part I., Chap. IV., verse 9.

## MANUSCRIPT FOUND, OR THE SPAULDING ROMANCE.

Those opposed to the claims of the "Book of Mormon" have for many years been asserting that the "Romance of Solomon Spaulding" furnished the plot for that book. They confidently avow it to have been the prime source from which it emanated. This opinion has been urged upon the people as being well founded. It has found its way into standard works, written by reputable authors. There seems to have been an effort to make it an historical fact, over the protest of those who knew the claim to be fraudulent. It has been inserted and enlarged upon in our encyclopædias, gazetteers, denominational histories, etc., so as to mislead the innocent parties in search of truth. Nothing better has been devised, as an excuse for not accepting as true the "Book of Mormon"; hence this has been confidently adhered to. Said manuscript, through accident or design, early found a resting-place in obscurity, and the enemies of the "Book of Mormon" avowed that its reading was similar to that book.

The manuscript could not be procured, in order to effect a comparison; hence those who fabricated these stories regarding it escaped condemnation at the public bar. But justice does not always slumber. In God's economy he did not permit that old manuscript to be destroyed; but in due time, in a mysterious manner, he has caused it to be brought to light, to the dismay and rebuke of those who have taken pleasure in inciting and circulating falsehoods concerning the origin of the "Book of Mormon." The history of its disclosure and publication cannot fail to be read with interest by all fair-minded and truth-loving persons. In a correspondence between President J. H. Fairchild, L. L. Rice, and President Joseph Smith, the revealment and identification of the

lost manuscript are clearly and credibly presented, as follows:—

“The theory of the origin of the ‘Book of Mormon’ in the traditional manuscript of Solomon Spaulding will probably have to be relinquished. That manuscript is doubtless now in the possession of Mr. L. L. Rice, of Honolulu, Hawaiian Islands, formerly an anti-slavery editor in Ohio, and for many years State printer at Columbus. During a recent visit to Honolulu, I suggested to Mr. Rice that he might have valuable anti-slavery documents in his possession, which he would be willing to contribute to the rich collection already in the Oberlin College Library. In pursuance of this suggestion, Mr. Rice began looking over his old pamphlets and papers, and at length came upon an old, worn, and faded manuscript of about one hundred and seventy-five pages, small quarto, purporting to be a history of the migrations and conflicts of the ancient Indian tribes, which occupied the territory now belonging to the States of New York, Ohio, and Kentucky. On the last page of this manuscript is a certificate and signature, giving the names of several persons known to the signer, who have assured him that to their personal knowledge the manuscript was the writing of Solomon Spaulding. Mr. Rice has no recollection how or when this manuscript came into his possession. It was enveloped in a coarse piece of wrapping-paper, and indorsed in Mr. Rice’s handwriting, ‘A Manuscript Story.’

“There seems no reason to doubt that this is the long-lost story. Mr. Rice, myself, and others compared it with the ‘Book of Mormon,’ and could detect no resemblance between the two, in general or in detail. There seems to be no name or incident common to the two. The solemn style of the ‘Book of Mormon,’ in imitation of the English Scriptures, does not appear in the manuscript. The only resemblance is



in the fact that both profess to set forth the history of lost tribes. Some other explanation of the origin of the 'Book of Mormon' must be found, if any explanation is required."

(Signed)

JAMES H. FAIRCHILD.

In reply to a letter written by Joseph Smith to L. L. Rice, he received from that gentleman the following letters:—

HONOLULU, SANDWICH ISLANDS,

March 28, 1885.

MR. JOSEPH SMITH:

The Spaulding manuscript in my possession came into my hands in this wise. In 1839–40 my partner and myself bought of E. D. Howe the Painesville *Telegraph*, published at Painesville, Ohio. The transfer of the printing department, types, press, etc., was accompanied with a large collection of books, manuscripts, etc., this manuscript of Spaulding among the rest. So, you see, it has been in my possession over forty years. But I never examined it, or knew the character of it, until some six or eight months since. The wrapper was marked, "Manuscript Story—Conneaut Creek." The wonder is, that in some of my movements I did not destroy or burn it with a large amount of rubbish that had accumulated from time to time.

It happened that President Fairchild was here on a visit, at the time I discovered the contents of it, and it was examined by him and others with much curiosity. Since President Fairchild published the fact of its existence in my possession, I have had applications for it from half a dozen sources, each applicant seeming to think he or she was entitled to it. Mr. Howe says . . . he obtained it from some source, and it was inadvertently transferred with the other effects of his printing-office. A. B. Deming, of Painesville, . . . wants me to send it to him. Mrs. Dickinson, of Boston, claiming to be

a relative of Spaulding, and who is getting up a book to show that he was the real author of the "Book of Mormon," wants it. She thinks, at least, it should be sent to Spaulding's daughter, a Mrs. somebody, but she does not inform me where she lives. Deming says that Howe borrowed it when he was getting up his book, and did not return it, as he should have done, etc.

This manuscript does not purport to be "a story of the Indians formerly occupying this continent"; but is a history of the wars between the Indians of Ohio and Kentucky, and their progress in civilization, etc. It is certain that this manuscript is not the origin of the "Book of Mormon," whatever some other manuscript may have been. The only similarity between them is, in the manner in which each purports to have been found, — one in a cave on Conneaut Creek, the other in a hill in Ontario County, New York. There is no identity of names, of persons or places, and there is no similarity of style between them. As I told Mr. Deming, I should as soon think the book of Revelation was written by the author of "Don Quixote," as that the writer of this manuscript was the author of the "Book of Mormon." . . .

I propose to hold it in my own hands for a while, to see if it cannot be put to some good use. Deming and Howe inform me that its existence is exciting great interest in that region. I am under a tacit but not a positive pledge to President Fairchild, to deposit it eventually in the library of Oberlin College. I shall be free from that pledge when I see an opportunity to put it to a better use.

Yours, etc.,

L. L. RICE.

P. S. — Upon reflection, since writing the foregoing, I am of the opinion that no one who reads this manuscript will give credit to the story that Solomon Spaulding was in any

wise the author of the "Book of Mormon." . . . Finally, I am more than half convinced that this is his only writing of the sort, and that any pretence that Spaulding was in any sense the author of the other, is a sheer fabrication. It was easy for anybody who may have seen this, or heard anything of its contents, to get up the story that they were identical.

L. L. R.

---

HONOLULU, SANDWICH ISLANDS,  
May 14, 1885.

MR. JOSEPH SMITH :

*Dear Sir,*— . . Two things are true concerning this manuscript in my possession : first, it is a genuine writing of Solomon Spaulding ; and second, it is *not* the original of the "Book of Mormon."

My opinion is, from all I have seen and learned, that this is the *only* writing of Spaulding.

You may be at rest as to my putting the manuscript into the possession of any one who will mutilate it, or use it for a bad purpose. I shall have it deposited in the library of Oberlin College, in Ohio, to be at the disposal for reading of any one who may wish to peruse it, but not to be removed from that depository. My friend, President Fairchild, may be relied on as security for the safe keeping of it. It will be sent there in July, by a friend who is going there to "take to himself a wife." Meantime, I have made a literal copy of the entire document, — errors of orthography, grammar, erasures, and all, — which I shall keep in my possession, so that any attempt to mutilate it will be of easy detection and exposure. Oberlin is a central place, in the vicinity of Conneaut, where the manuscript was written. . . .

Rev. Dr. Hyde, president of the institution, in this place, for training native missionaries for Micronesia (a very prominent and successful institution), has written an elaborate

account of this manuscript and sent it for publication in the *Congregationalist*, of Boston. I presume it will be published, and you will be interested in reading it.

Very respectfully yours

L. L. RICE.

In a postscript, Mr. Rice says he found the following indorsement on the manuscript:—

“The writings of Solomon Spaulding proved by Aaron Wright, Oliver Smith, John N. Miller, and others. The testimonies of the above gentlemen are now in my possession.

(Signed) D. P. HURLBUT.”

[COPY OF MR. RICE'S LETTER.]

HONOLULU, S. I., June 12, 1885.

PRESIDENT J. H. FAIRCHILD:

Herewith I send to you the Solomon Spaulding manuscript, to be deposited in the library of Oberlin College, for reference by any one who may be desirous of seeing or examining it. It has been in my possession forty-six years,—from 1839 to 1885,—and for forty-four years of that time no one examined it, and I was not aware of the character of its contents. I send it to you in the same wrapper and tied with the same string that must have enclosed it for near half a century, certainly during the forty-six years since it came into my possession. . . .

Truly yours, etc.,

L. L. RICE.

P. S.—The words “Solomon Spaulding's Writings,” in ink on the wrapper, were written by me, after I became aware of the contents. The words “Manuscript Story—Conneaut Creek,” in faint pencilling, were as now when it came into my possession.

OBERLIN COLLEGE, OBERLIN, O.,  
July 23, 1885.

I have this day delivered to Mr. E. L. Kelley a copy of the manuscript of Solomon Spaulding, sent from Honolulu by Mr. L. L. Rice, to the library of Oberlin College, for safe keeping, and now in my care. The copy was prepared at Mr. Kelley's request, under my supervision, and is, as I believe, an exact transcript of the original manuscript, including erasures, misspellings, etc.

JAMES H. FAIRCHILD,  
*President of Oberlin College.*

---

KIRTLAND, O., July 24, 1885.

PRESIDENT W. W. BLAIR, Lamoni, Iowa:

Herewith I transmit to you the copy of the Spaulding manuscript, prepared by President Fairchild, as attested by him, together with his certificate and photograph sheets.

E. L. KELLEY.

This is an effectual disposition of the old Spaulding fraud.



## APPENDIX A.

---

PAGE 14.

---

### 4. Moses a High Priest.

Moses, in his character of official position and authority, was the type of the Christ.

The Lord says: "I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him." — Deut. xviii. 18.

The new law-giver was to be the complete antitype of this Moses in the wilderness — combine in his official right all the authority incident to the meek man who led Israel from the first bondage. This antitype in his priestly office was in the "similitude of Melchisedec." — Heb. vii. 15.

"Behold, I have given him for a witness to the people, a leader and commander to the people." — Isa. lv. 4.

He was prophet, priest, and king. "Who was faithful to him that appointed him, as also Moses was faithful in all his house." Heb. iii. 2.

"And Moses verily was faithful in all his house as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after." — *Ibid.*, iii. 5.

Moses too, then, was a "witness" — the great typical priest of his time. "For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people." — *Ibid.*, ix. 19. This priest, also, must have been "in the similitude of Melchisedec," for he was greater than Aaron in his official standing.

This purification by Moses foreshadowed the purification of the heavenly things by Christ.

"It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are

the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." — *Ibid.*, ix. 23, 24.

Moses in his service in the tabernacle on earth typified in his act of purifying and entering the holy places made with hands, the figures of the true, — that of the Christ as he entered heaven itself, — offering the better sacrifice; not to so enter makes the type untrue, if Christ entered heaven.

In the performance of this work Moses officiated in his priestly character, because there was no *perfect* representation of the "true," unless "*the holy places*" were *purified and entered* by such a high priest.

So it is written, "Moses and Aaron among my priests"; but Moses takes precedence of Aaron in all things as a high priest. "Moses himself, as the representative of the unseen king, is the consecrator, the sacrificer throughout these ceremonies" (setting Aaron and his sons apart to the priestly offices); "as the channel through which the others received their office, he has for the time a higher priesthood than that of Aaron. (De Syneder, i. 1-16; Ugoline, xii. 3.)" — *Smith's Bible Dictionary*, by HACKETT, Vol. III., page 2575.

"If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make myself known unto him in a vision, and will speak unto him in a dream.

"My servant Moses is not so, who is faithful in all mine house." — Num. xii. 6, 7.

Thus the high priest who entered yearly into the "holy place" (Heb. ix. 7) was not equal to the one who set up or purified the tabernacle, and first entered, who was *the* type of the true.

Moses was not only in his prophetic and priestly character a true type of the Messiah, but also in his kingship. "He was king in Jeshurun, when the heads of the people and the tribes of Israel were gathered together." — Deut. xxxiii. 5. Priest, king, judge, and ruler.

"Faithful in all mine house." His authority permitted him to act in all the offices of the house of God, and he performed his work faithfully as a prophet, high priest, and king.

And the song of Moses and the Lamb (Rev. xv. 3) is to be



sung by those who stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God, saying, "Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou King of Saints."

---

## APPENDIX B.

---

PAGE 66.

---

The divided opinion that has arisen regarding the parentage of "James, the Lord's brother," we may with propriety conjecture was on account, to some extent, at least, of a prevailing sentimentality that arose in after years, that Mary, the mother of Jesus, was too immaculate to have borne children other than the Christ. Roman Catholics insist that Mary was "ever Virgin," and of course there has been an effort by various writers to bend history to conform to that opinion. Eminent writers are at variance upon this question, and it may be said, therefore, to be an open question. The plain facts seem to be that "James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas" were "brethren of the Lord," all sons of Joseph, "the carpenter." (Matt. xiii. 55; Mark iii. 6.) Jesus, of course, was the ("supposed to be") son of Joseph, as the people in common did not understand in regard to his extraordinary conception. (Luke iii. 26.) It should be borne in mind, however, that the people understood that they were children of the carpenter Joseph, and brothers to Jesus, and not cousins of his, as is held in many divergent theories. The confusion, or the formulation of many vague theories, arose from the excessive number of Jameses and Marys who lived at that time, and the strong disposition that prevailed afterwards to keep the mother of Jesus "ever Virgin." In John xix. 25 we have presented "His mother, his mother's sister, Mary the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene." The name of the Virgin's sister is not given; but some suppose that her name was Mary, also, and that she was the mother of the persons known as "brethren of the Lord"; and is to be identified with the Mary of Mark xiv. 40, Matt. xxvii. 56;

but this view of the matter is repudiated by others. It is clear, however, that if they were the children of this sister of the Virgin, they were not the children of Cleophas, neither the children of Joseph by a previous marriage, or any other marriage with him, as is held by some writers, unless we allow him to have had two wives at the same time, the Virgin and the Virgin's sister, which would hardly be considered good philosophy in these Christian times. It is held again that "James the less" is to be identified with "James, the Lord's brother," and that he was the son of Cleophas or another of the Virgin's sisters; but neither is certain, and it is obvious that he could not be the son of both. The matter seems to be clear enough, if we accept that the people knew the truth of the matter, that "James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas" were sons of the "carpenter" and brothers of Jesus, and that Paul knew what he affirmed when he called "James, the Lord's brother." (Gal. i. 19.) The position taken in "Presidency and Priesthood" in regard to James is not affected in either case, for none will deny that James was the next of age to Jesus in the family of Joseph, who, by right of inheritance, became the head in the favored family, and first rights and prerogatives belonged to the eldest and nearest of kin, and not to the son of Zebedee. The following learned discussion in regard to James the son of Alphæus and others may be read with both interest and profit, as this to many is a vexed question, but a vital one:—

"JAMES, *the son of Alphæus*. He also was one of the apostles, and is mentioned in all the four lists (Matt. x. 3; Mark iii. 18; Luke vi. 15; Acts i. 13) by this name, but in no other place. It is, however, thought by some that he is the same with *James, the Lord's brother*. In Matt. xiii. 55 and Mark vi. 3 the brethren of the Lord are named James, Joses, Judas, and Simon. It is also to be remarked that they are in both places spoken of as the children of the carpenter; that is, of Joseph, the husband of the Virgin Mary. But it has been urged that they were called sons of Joseph and Mary because the children of two families—of Mary the Virgin and Mary the wife of Clopas, her half sister—were brought up together. Those who in this way make James, the Lord's brother, to be a son of Al-

phæus, require to establish (a) that Clopas is the same name as Alphæus; (b) that Mary the wife of Clopas (John xix. 25) was the sister of the Virgin Mary; and (c) that this Mary, wife of Clopas, is the same who is called (Matt. xxvi. 56; Mark xv. 40) Mary the mother of James and Joses, and (Mark xvi. 1; Luke xxiv. 10) simply the mother of James, in which four passages the same person is intended. But the identity of the names Alphæus and Clopas is by no means certain. Those who maintain it take Cleophas as the Aramaic Chalpai, and Alphæus to be a Græcized form thereof. But when we turn to what might be supposed the best source of evidence on this point, viz., the Peshito version of the New Testament, instead of finding the two names treated as the same word, we find in all cases Chalpai where the Greek has Alphæus, and where Clopas or Cleopas occurs, it is simply translated Kleopha. The same is the case with the Jerusalem Syriac. The identity of these names is thus far from being established. Then in John xix. 25 the versions and best authorities are in favor of making four persons of those there mentioned, 'his mother and his mother's sister, and Mary the wife of Clopas and Mary Magdalene.' This is the Peshito rendering, and, even if the conjunction were not there, it is not uncommon in Scriptural enumeration to find names given in pairs without any conjunction, while to make Mary the wife of Clopas the Virgin's sister would be to assume two Mary's in the same family of sisters, which is not very probable. Whether Mary wife of Clopas was the mother of James (called in one place 'the little') and of Joses can neither be asserted nor denied from the evidence in the Gospel; but when the other two assumptions have so little foundation to rest on, it seems impossible to consider the son of Alphæus the same person with the 'brother of the Lord.'

"Further, James, the Lord's brother, was bishop of Jerusalem (Comp. Gal. i. 19 with Gal. ii. 9-12), and was president of the church in its earliest days (Acts xii. 17, xv. 13, xxi. 18). Such a position required him to be a resident in Jerusalem, while had he been an apostle (as the son of Alphæus was) we should have expected him to take his share of the missionary

labor of publishing the gospel in distant lands. But this bishop of Jerusalem was the author of the epistle of St. James. He simply styles himself in the introduction thereto, 'Servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ.' He who could thus write with the certainty of being identified must have been the most famous person of his name in the church, must have been what St. Paul, in a passage (Gal. ii. 9) where he places James before both Peter and John, calls him 'a pillar' of the Christian society. . . .

"It seems right, therefore, to conclude that James the son of Alphæus, one of the apostles, was a different person from James the Lord's brother and bishop of Jerusalem. Of the history of the former we are told nothing except that he was an apostle. The latter is spoken of by St. Peter (Acts ii. 17) as if he were at that time the recognized head of the Christian community in Jerusalem. Again (Acts iv. 13), after the debate at Jerusalem about the circumcision of the Gentiles, it is he who sums up the arguments and declares the sentence of the council as if he were the chief person among them.

"He was put to death by order of Ananus, the high priest, by being thrown from a pinnacle of the temple, immediately before the destruction of Jerusalem." — *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Vol. III., pages 592 and 593.

---

## APPENDIX C.

---

"JUDE, the writer of the Epistle of St. Jude (Ἰουδᾶς), calls himself (verse 1) 'the brother of James.' In primitive Christian times, among Judæo-Christians, to whom this Epistle, from the nature of its contents, must have been addressed, there was but one James who could thus be spoken of without any further description, viz., James 'the Lord's brother.' The writer of this Epistle, then, claims to be the Judas named among the brethren of the Lord in Matt. xiii. 55; Mark vii. 3.

He seems himself to declare by implication that he was not an apostle (verse 17), and with this agrees the statement (John vii. 5), that at a time not long before the crucifixion, the brethren of Jesus did not believe on him. And it is some confirmation of this position that the writer of the Epistle of St. James, in like manner, does not claim to be an apostle." [It is the evident position of the writer here that Jude and James disclaim to hold positions with the twelve apostles as such. That officially they did not belong to that body, yet Paul expressly states that James was an apostle. Gal. i. 19.] "The brethren of the Lord are spoken of in Acts i. 14 as distinct from the apostolic body, and are placed in the enumeration as though latest included among the believers; and that their feelings toward Jesus should have been changed since his death and resurrection has been thought to be sufficiently explained by the assertion of St. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 7) that the Lord had been 'seen of James' on one special occasion after he had risen from the dead. We conclude, therefore, that the writer of the Epistle was a different person from Jude the apostle, who appears also to have had the name Lebbæus and Thaddæus (Comp. Matt. x. 3, Mark iii. 18, with Luke vi. 16, Acts i. 13).

"From the notices of the descendants of Jude, the brother of the Lord, preserved by Eusebius (H. E., iii. 19, 23) from Hegessippus, we should conclude that they were resident in Palestine. It seems natural, therefore, to suppose that the Epistle was written in Palestine, and, it may be, for some Jewish converts in some district of that country. But of this we can have no certainty. If, as seems to be intimated by Hegessippus, Jude was dead in the time of Domitian, we perhaps shall not be far wrong in assigning the composition of the Epistle to about 80 A. D." It "appears to have been written after the second Epistle of St. Peter." — *Encyclopædia Britannica*, pages 771, 772.

It appears from a statement of Paul (1 Cor. ix. 5) that the "Brethren of the Lord" were prominent persons in the church in his time. They are mentioned in connection with Cephas and other apostles.

## APPENDIX D.

---

It should be constantly borne in mind that the title of bishop was not applied to James in order to designate the chief officer in the Church in the time of the apostles. The learned do not know what title of office he bore. The term bishop was applied by more modern writers to the chief officer of the ancient church, because by that title they assumed to designate their own chief officer or officers of the clergy, not knowing by what name the first officer in the Jerusalem church was known. Some say he had no distinctive title. But Paul says he was an apostle (Gal. i. 19), and it is quite evident that he was not a member of the College of Twelve Apostles. Following the tradition of the elders in the belief that there could be but twelve apostles at one time, the learned are at a loss to know what to do with the thirteenth one, it would seem, so they concluded, as he had no other distinctive title, to call him bishop. It is assumed, however, that bishops succeeded to the offices of the apostles after the death of the latter, and that the apostolic office is in the Episcopate, the chief bishop being the head or Pope. But in the time of the apostles the apostolic office was one thing and that of bishop was quite another, and both classes of offices and officers existed in the church at the same time. Just how, in after ages, the apostolic office became blended with that of the bishop, wherein it lost its identity, or was superseded altogether by that of the bishop, or that the apostolic office is in the Episcopate, is much easier to assert than to prove, or even show to be reasonable. The following learned discussion of the distinction between presbyters and bishops may be read with both interest and profit. Also what is added under the head of Patriarch, Evangelist, and Prophet.

## RELATION OF PRESBYTERS TO BISHOPS.

“What were the primitive relations of presbyters to bishops, is a question which cannot be overlooked; yet to which, with

evidence at present available, only a tentative answer can be given. Most probably, as the former were of Jewish, so the latter were of Gentile, origin, as the former presided over Jewish, so the latter in the first instance presided over Gentile communities. Hence when the distinction between Gentile, and Jewish communities began to fade away, the two sets of officers, fulfilling as they did analogous functions, were regarded as having equivalent rank. This point must be taken as having been conceded by almost all important writers upon the subject in ancient and modern times. . . .

“ It must be, however, noted that there is a tendency in many writers to press the evidence too far, and to infer an original identity of bishops and presbyters. Whereas all that can be legitimately inferred is as stated above (an equivalence of rank). As intercommunion increased between Judæo-Christian and Gentile communities, those who passed from one to the other tended to use the names bishop and presbyter interchangeably, but how the two offices came to coexist as distinct offices in the same community is the most difficult point in the whole complex question; nor does it seem possible upon existing evidence to give any other than the general answer that there was a fusion of the Judæo-Christian and the Gentile organizations, and this fusion was a gradual one. But whether this or some other be the true explanation of the coexistence of the two offices, the fact of such coexistence must be admitted, though its universality may be denied. Out of the fact two other questions spring: (1) How was it that the relative rank of the two offices changed from one of equivalence to one of subordination? (2) and how was it that the title episcopate, rather than any other, attached permanently to the head of the ecclesiastical organization?

(1.) “ To the first question many answers have been given, in both ancient and modern times, when, as early as the end of the fourth century, Aetius appealed to St. Paul’s language as evidence that bishops and presbyters were not identical, though admitting that the difference between the two orders lay only in the power of ordination. He propounded the theory that in some cases bishops had been appointed and not presbyters, and

in other presbyters but not bishops. In either case, however, deacons were necessary, and hence St. Paul speaks sometimes of deacons and bishops, sometimes of deacons and presbyters. Assuming that Timothy was (1) a bishop, (2) a bishop in the latter sense, he regards the command 'Rebuke not an elder' (1 Tim. v. 1) as conclusive proof of the superiority of the one order to the other. Almost contemporary with this was the theory of Jerome, that the episcopate rose out of the presbyterate as a safeguard against schisms. At first there were several presbyters in one church, but afterwards one was selected to preside over the rest. . . .

"Later theories on the subject are so numerous as to make the discussion of them an almost endless task; and it must be sufficient here to refer to the more important of those which have been advanced during the present century.

. . . . .

"It may be useful to point out that in all probability the question does not admit of a single answer, and that the relations of presbyters to bishops varied widely in the several groups into which the churches of the first two centuries may be arranged.

"(a.) The case of Jerusalem stands on a peculiar footing. The Acts of the Apostles preserves the tradition, which is confirmed by later authorities, that James had a kind of a presidency over the Judæo-Christian community which existed there. The nature of that presidency is uncertain. The Clementines speak of him as 'episcopas,' but there is no contemporary evidence of his having possessed the designation; nor, even if the tradition of the two hundredth century be admitted as to the possession of the designation, is there any such evidence to show how far the relation in which he stood to the other apostles or to the 'elders' was analogous to that which existed between the bishops and presbyters of later time. The most probable conjecture is, that in this case the conception of a visible head of the church arose from the belief in the nearness of the second advent.

"James, as the Lord's brother, was regarded as occupying His place until He came. It is also probable that, as Gfrörer thinks,



after the fall of Jerusalem, men's thoughts turned to Rome as the centre of the Christian organization, and that the pseudo-petrine literature of the second century, which originated at Rome, had for its chief object to impress the hierarchical ideas, of which it is full, upon the Roman mind. . . .

“(b.) In the larger communities, such as Rome and Ephesus, in which the influence of a single apostle had for some years dominated, it was natural that the monarchical ideas should tend to prevail after the apostle himself had passed away. The existence of such a dominance is here assumed. . . . In such communities, therefore, there is strong historical evidence to show that from early times there was a recognized and permanent president. But here also there is no evidence to show the precise relation in which the president stood to the presbyterate. It is, however, a significant fact that Irenæus speaks of the early heads of the Roman Church as *presbyters*. . . .

“(c.) In the cases of the churches of other cities, in which, it must be borne in mind, there is no evidence of the existence of a president or bishop until the middle of the second century, it appears to be sufficient to point to the general analogy of the contemporary communities, after which, in so many respects, the early churches were modelled. Democratical as those communities were in the main, they still had a president. We find such a president (a) in the Greek associations under several titles. . . .

“A presiding officer became indispensable, and the officer so appointed was known by the title which was in current use to designate the financial officer of the community. . . .

“This function of the Christian bishop continued to be a primary one, even after many other functions clustered around his office. It is not sound to reason from the functions of bishops in the third or fourth centuries to their functions in the first; but at the same time, the fact that the bishops were the custodians and dispensers of church funds in the later period corroborates the inference which is drawn from other data, that they were so also in the earlier. . . .

“The custodian of the church funds was also the custodian of the lists of persons among whom those funds were to be

divided. . . . Hence also the bishop, as custodian of the list, was the proper officer for giving certificates of membership (that is, one entitled to benefits from the church treasury).

“The jealous care with which the right of giving it was guarded, shows the importance which was attached to it, and supports the inference that it played no inconsiderable part in the exaltation of the episcopate in relation to the presbyterate.

“The presbyterate also lost ground in the second century, through the large development within the churches of opinions which were at variance with the general currents of apostolic doctrine. . . . It became necessary to distinguish between the true and the false traditions. . . . The bishop, who had by this time begun to be prominent above the presbyters, was regarded as a kind of incarnate tradition, the pure and uncorrupted spring of apostolic truth. . . . These causes operated with different degrees of force in different communities; and it is by no means certain when the subordination of the order of the presbyters to a single officer first became general. The evidence, whether for the existence of bishops or for their superior authority, cannot be pressed further than the facts warrant. . . . It may be admitted that bishops existed as church officers, without also admitting that they occupied in relation to the presbyterate the same position which they occupied afterwards. . . . But by the beginning of the third century, the organization of most all churches had begun to conform to a single type, bishop, presbyters, and deacons. In some places the older organization lingered on, and there are many indications that the presbyters did not allow their privileges to be curtailed without a struggle. That struggle came to a head in Montanism, and the triumph of the episcopate over the presbyterate was by no means secure until *Montanism* was crushed. . . . When this type was once established, several circumstances combined to render the subordination of the presbyterate more complete. But even after these influences had begun to operate, the difference between the two orders was rather a difference of rank than of function.”  
— *Smith and Cheatham's Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, pages 1700, 1701, 1702, 1703.

## APPENDIX E.

The following was written by Cobbett also, who was raised in the Established Church of England, but who writes with a strong Catholic bias, so much so that one is inclined to believe that his preferred faith was Roman Catholic, rather than the faith of the English Church; and hence he can be relied upon to state favorably the Roman Catholic faith, and the facts at least concerning the rise and the establishment of the Church of England, as his nearest relatives were members of that church, and he himself was raised in it, and there is no statement made that he ever left it.

“(40.) The Catholic Church *originated* with Jesus Christ himself. He selected Peter to be the *head* of his church. This apostle’s name was Simon; but his master called him Peter, which means a *stone* or *rock*; and he said, ‘On this *rock* will I build my church.’ Look at the Gospel of St. Matthew, xvi. 18, 19, and that of St. John xxi. 15, and onward, and you will see that we must deny the truth of the Scriptures, or acknowledge that here was a *head of the church* promised for all generations.

“(41.) St. Peter died a martyr at Rome in about sixty years after the birth of Christ. But *another supplied his place*; and there is the most satisfactory evidence that the chain of succession has remained unbroken from that day to this. When I said, in paragraph 10, that it *might* be said that there was no Pope seated at Rome for the first *three hundred years*, I by no means meant to admit the fact; but to get rid of a pretence which, at any rate, could not apply to England, which was converted to Christianity by missionaries *sent by a Pope*, the successor of other Popes, who had been seated at Rome for hundreds of years. The truth is, that from the persecutions which, for the first three hundred years, the church underwent, the *Chief Bishops*, successors of St. Peter, had not always the means of openly maintaining their *supremacy*; but they always

*existed*; there was always a *Chief Bishop*; and his supremacy was always acknowledged by the Church; that is to say, by all the Christians then in the world.

“(42.) Of later date, the *Chief Bishop* has been called, in our language, the POPE, and in the French, PAPE. In the Latin he is called PAPA, which is a union and abbreviation of the two Latin words, *Pater Patriæ*, which means father of fathers. Hence comes the appellation of *Papa*, which children of all *Christian nations* give to their fathers; an appellation of the highest respect and most ardent and sincere affection. Thus, then, the POPE, each as he has succeeded to his office, became the chief or head of the Church; and his *supreme* power and authority were acknowledged, as I have observed in paragraph 3, by all the bishops and all the teachers of Christianity, in all nations where that religion existed. The Pope was and is assisted by a body of persons called Cardinals or Great Councillors; and at various and numerous times, councils of the church have been held, in order to discuss and settle matters of deep interest to the unity and well-being of the church. These councils have been held in all the countries of Christendom. Many were held in England. . . .

“At the time when this religion was introduced, England was governed by seven kings, and that state was called the HEP-TARCHY. The people of the whole country were PAGANS. Yes, my friends, our ancestors were pagans. They worshipped gods made with hands, and they sacrificed children on the altars of their idols. . . . Now, please to bear in mind that this great event took place in the year 596. The Protestant writers have been strangely embarrassed in their endeavors to make it out that, *up to that time* or thereabouts, the Catholic Church was *pure*, and trod in the steps of the apostles; but that *after this time*, that church became *corrupt*. They applaud the character and acts of Pope Gregory; they do the same with regard to Austin: shame would not suffer them to leave their names out of the calendar, but still they want to make it out that there was no *pure* Christian religion after the Pope came to be the visible and acknowledged head, and to have *supreme* authority. There are scarcely any two of them that agree upon this point.

Some say that it was 300, some 400, some 500, and some 600, before the Catholic Church ceased to be the true church of Christ. But none of them can deny, nor dare they attempt to, that it was the Christian religion as practised at *Rome*; that it was the *Roman Catholic* religion that was introduced into England in the year 596, with all its dogmas, rites, and ceremonies and observances, just as they all continued to exist at the time of the Reformation, and as they continue to exist in that church *even unto this day*.

“But further regarding Henry VIII. (61.) This king succeeded his father, Henry VII., in the year 1509. He succeeded to a great and prosperous kingdom, a full treasury, and a happy, contented people, who expected in him the wisdom of his father without his avarice, which seemed to have been that father's only fault. Henry VIII. was eighteen years old when his father died. He had had an elder brother, named Arthur, who, at the early age of *twelve years*, had been betrothed to Catherine, fourth daughter of Ferdinand, King of Castile and Arragon. When Arthur was *fourteen years* old, the Princess came to England and the *marriage* ceremony was performed; but Arthur, who was a weak and sickly boy, died before the year was out, and the marriage never was *consummated*; and, indeed, who will believe it could be? Henry wished to marry Catherine, and the marriage was *agreed to by the parents on both sides*; but it did not take place until after the death of Henry VII. The moment the young king came to the throne, he took measures for his marriage. Catherine being, though only *nominally*, the *widow* of his deceased brother, it was necessary to have from the Pope, as supreme head of the church, a *dispensation*, in order to render the marriage lawful in the eye of the canon law. The dispensation, to which there could be no valid objection, was obtained, and the marriage was, amidst the rejoicings of the whole nation, celebrated in June, 1509, in less than two months after the king's accession.

“(62.) With this lady, who was beautiful in her youth, and whose virtues of all sorts seem scarcely ever to have been exceeded, he lived in the married state *seventeen years*, before the end of which he had three sons and two daughters by her,

one of whom only, a daughter, was still alive, who afterwards was Mary, Queen of England. But now, at the end of *seventeen years*, he being thirty-five years of age, and eight years younger than the queen, and having cast his eyes on a young lady, an attendant on the queen, named Anne Boleyn, he, all of a sudden, affected to believe that he was *living in sin*, because he was married to *the widow of his brother*; though as we have seen, the marriage between Catherine and the brother had never been consummated, and though the parents of both parties, together with his own council, unanimously and unhesitatingly approved of his marriage, which had moreover been sanctioned by the Pope, the head of the church; of the faith and observances of which, Henry himself had, as we shall see hereafter, been long since his marriage a zealous *defender*.

“(63.) But the tyrant’s passions were now in motion, and he resolved to gratify his *bestly lust*, cost what it might in reputation, in treasure, or in blood. He first applied to the Pope to *divorce* him from the queen. He was a great favorite with the Pope; he was very powerful; there were many strong motives for yielding to his request; but that request was so full of injustice, it would have been so cruel towards the virtuous queen to accede to it, that the Pope could not and did not grant it. . . .

“The tyrant now became furious, resolved upon overthrowing the power of the Pope in England, upon making *himself* the head of the church in this country, and upon doing whatever else might be necessary to ensure the gratification of his beastly desires and the glutting of his vengeance.

“(65.) . . . The tyrant, being now both *pope* and *king*, made Cranmer Archbishop of Canterbury. . . . (67.) It was now four or five years since the king and Cranmer had begun to hatch the project of the *divorce*; but, in the meanwhile, the king had *kept* Anne Boleyn, or in more modern phrase, she had been ‘under his *protection*,’ for about three years. . . . (68.) A private marriage took place in January, 1533. . . . It became necessary to avow her marriage; it was also necessary to press onward the *trial* for the *divorce*; for it might have seemed *rather awkward*, even amongst ‘reformation’ people, for the

king to have *two wives at the same time!* Now, then, the famous ecclesiastical Judge Cranmer had to play his part. . . .

“(69.) The king granted a license to hold a spiritual court for the trial of the divorce of Queen Catherine. . . . Cranmer opened his *court* (at Dunstable), and sent a citation to the queen to appear before him, which citation she treated with the scorn it deserved. When he had kept his *court* open the number of days required by the law, he pronounced sentence against the queen, declaring her marriage with the king *null from the beginning*. . . . (73.) Cranmer held another court at Lambeth; at which he declared that the king had been *lawfully* married to Anne Boleyn; and that he now confirmed the marriage by his *pastoral* and *judicial* authority, which he derived from the successors of the apostles. . . . She (Anne) was delivered of a daughter (who was afterwards *Queen Elizabeth*). This did not please the king, who wanted a *son*, and who was quite monster enough to be displeased with her on this account. The couple jogged on apparently without quarrelling for about *three years*. . . . The husband, however, had plenty of occupation, for, being now ‘*head of the church*,’ he had a deal to manage; he had, poor man, to labor hard at making a new religion, new articles of faith, new rules of discipline. . . . Besides which, he had, as we shall see in the next number, some of the best men in his kingdom, and that ever lived in any kingdom or country, to *behead, hang, rip up, and cut into quarters*. . . . (72) In January, 1536, Queen Catherine died. She had been banished from the court. She had seen her marriage *annulled* by Cranmer, and her daughter and only surviving child *bastardized* by act of Parliament; and that husband, who had five children by her, that ‘*reformation*’ husband, had had the barbarity to keep her separated from, and never to suffer her, after her banishment, to *set her eyes on, that only child!* . . . In just three months and sixteen days from this (the day of the deceased queen’s burial) she (Anne) *died herself*; not, however, as the real queen had died, in her bed, deeply lamented by all the good, and without a soul on earth to impute to her a single fault, but on a *scaffold*, under a death-warrant signed by her husband, and charged with *treason, adultery, and incest*. . . . (75.) But before Anne

was executed, our friend Thomas Cranmer had another *tough job* to perform. The king, who never did things by halves, ordered, us '*head of the church*,' the archbishop to hold his spiritual court, and to *divorce* him from Anne. . . . (76.) He cited the king and queen to appear in his '*court*'! His citation stated that their marriage had been *unlawful*, that they were living in *adultery*, and that, for the '*salvation of their souls*,' they should come and *show cause* why they should not be *separated*. They were just going to be *separated* most effectually; for this was on the 17th of May, and Anne, who had been condemned to death on the 15th, was to be and was executed on the 19th! They both obeyed his citation, and appeared before him by their proctors; and after having heard these, Cranmer, who, observe, afterwards drew up *the Book of Common Prayer*, covered up the blasphemous phrase by pronouncing, '*in the name of Christ, and for the honor of God*,' that the marriage '*was, and always had been, null and void*'! Thus was the daughter, Elizabeth, bastardized by the decision of the very man who had not only pronounced her mother's marriage lawful, but had been the contriver of that marriage. On the 19th *Anne* was beheaded in the Tower, put into an elm coffin and buried there. . . . (77.) On the 15th she is condemned as the *wife* of the king, on the 17th she is pronounced *never to have been his wife*, and on the 19th she is *executed* for having been his *unfaithful wife*. . . . What man, with an honorable sentiment in his mind, is there, who does not almost wish to be a *foreigner*, rather than be the countryman of Cranmer and Henry the VIII.?"—WILLIAM COBBETT'S *History of the Protestant Reformation*, chapter second, pages 19 to 35.

— "It is noteworthy that the Constantinople '*Typecum*' expressly forbids St. Peter to be called the Apostle of Rome, inasmuch as he was a teacher and enlightener of the whole world; and it hints that if any place is to be connected with his name, it should be Antioch (Daniel, Codex Lit. iv. 261)." — *Smith and Cheatham's Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, page 106.



## APPENDIX F.

The following is a fair and conservative presentation of the origin and views of Congregationalists, which may be read in connection with what is already written of them, beginning on page 166 of this book.

“The Rev. John Robinson is regarded as the father of Congregationalists. He organized a dissenting church in the north of England in 1602, but was driven, with his followers, by persecution, into Holland. They settled at Leyden, and there conducted their church according to the principles which still prevail in New England. There was full sympathy between Robinson and his followers and the Puritans of England in some points, but they differed in others. It was the younger portion of Robinson’s congregation that composed the band of ‘Pilgrims’ that sailed for America in the ‘Mayflower’ and made the first settlement in New England, in 1620. There is no ‘Congregational Church’ in this or any other country, in the sense in which the word is usually applied. But there is a collection of Congregational churches who constitute the denomination. The Congregationalists define a church to be an organization of professed believers statedly meeting at one place, and united together by a covenant or agreement, mutually to watch over and edify each other; and for the maintenance of the ordinances of the Gospel. A church, as thus understood, differs from a congregation, which includes all those who assemble in a place of worship, non-communicants as well as communicants.

“A church also differs from ‘a society,’ which is a legal phrase, intended to represent those persons who are incorporated by the law of the land for the purpose of holding and transferring property and providing for the expenses of the church. The church also differs from the ‘parish,’ which last is a term properly employed only to designate territorial limits. Congregationalists insist upon the competence of each church to elect its own officers.

“The internal structure of Congregationalist societies is of

the simplest nature. Their only officers are *pastors* and *deacons*, for the office of *ruling elder* was abolished about the year 1745, first at Plymouth, and afterwards in all the churches.

“The deacons are elected from and by the church members. The pastors are chosen by the members of the church from among those persons who are already in the ministry, and settled over the churches, or are recommended by well-known clergymen as fit to assume the functions of the pastoral office. In electing a pastor it is usual for the ‘church’ to nominate a person to the ‘society,’ and upon the concurrence of the latter, to give an invitation to the latter to settle. Provision for the pastor is made either by a voluntary subscription or a tax, or from the pew rents. When a pastor who is selected accepts the congregation tendered him, he is inducted into office by a council of ministers; being ordained by them if he has never before been set apart to the ministry; otherwise simply installed. . . . The pastor is the moderator of the church, the spiritual counsellor of its members, their authorized teacher, and has full control over the pulpit, administers the ordinance of baptism and the Lord’s Supper, and performs the marriage ceremony. The deacons distribute the alms of the church, visit the sick and needy, and are the counsellors of the minister whenever he desires the benefit of their advice. Congregationalists believe in the purity of the ministry, and hold that there is but one order of ministers. The deacons they regard as belonging to the laity. Licentiates are not ministers, but merely candidates for the sacred office. Those ministers who are employed to preach to the church from one year to the other, without being installed, are termed supplies. The terms bishop and elder are not often used by Congregationalists, but when they are employed, are intended merely to represent the pastors. Excommunication is enforced as the penalty upon those who make themselves amenable to church discipline by irregularities of conduct.

“The liturgy and form of worship of Congregationalists are simple. . . . The doctrine, of the Orthodox Congregationalists are in all essential points the same as those taught in the West-

minster Confession of 1643. In other words, they are Calvinists in faith, believing in absolute decrees in reference to man's salvation. They believe in man's total depravity by nature, and in his eternal punishment in hell if he does not repent before death. They admit infants' baptism and practise it. In 1785 the Congregationalists were divided, and now form two distinct organizations: those having the orthodox faith, and those whose religious views are Unitarian. The latter control Harvard University." — *History of Religious Denominations of the World, both ancient and modern*, in the Holy Bible, by Gay Bros. & Co., 27 Barclay Street, New York.

#### EVANGELISTS, PATRIARCHS, PROPHETS.

These officers are alluded to here in order to present, as nearly as possible, the relative positions held by them in the early Christian Church, so far as may be learned from history, tradition, or the ancient languages, although it is but little that is known by even the most learned and sagacious of men. It is conceded, however, from what is known, that the classes of officers named formed a part of the early Christian ministry.

#### EVANGELISTS.

"The constitution of the Apostolic Church included an order or body of men known as Evangelists. The absence of any detailed account of the organization and practical working of the church of the first century leaves us in some uncertainty as to their functions and positions.

"The meaning of the name, 'the publishers of glad tidings,' seems common to the work of the Christian ministry generally, yet in Eph. iv. 11 . . . Assuming that the apostles here, whether limited to the twelve or not, are those who were looked on as the special delegates and representatives of Christ, and therefore higher than all others in their authority, and that the prophets were men speaking, under the immediate impulse of the Spirit, words that were mighty in their effects on men's hearts and consciences, it would follow that the evangelists had a function subordinate to theirs, yet more conspicuous, and so far higher than that of the pastor's who watched over a church

that had been founded, and of the teachers who carried on the work of systematic instruction. This passage accordingly would lead us to think of them as standing between the two other groups sent forth as missionary preachers of the gospel by the first, and as such preparing the way for the labors of the second.

“The same inference would seem to follow the occurrence of the word as applied to Philip in Acts xxi. 8.” — *Smith's Bible Dictionary*, page 786, by HACKETT.

#### PATRIARCH.

“The title patriarch seems to have been introduced into the Christian church from the latter organization of the Jews. In pre-Christian times there was a subdivision of the tribe, and one of the titles of the heads of these subdivisions was patriarch. . . . The title seems to have been in use in the Christian churches before its extinction among the Jews. The earliest references to it are vague; nor is it clear in what sense it was used, or to whom it was restricted. . . . In its most important use the title has been confined to the bishops of the five sees of Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem.” — *Smith and Cheatham's Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, page 1573.

#### PROPHETS.

“We find, therefore, that there were prophets in the oldest church, that of Jerusalem (Acts xi. 27; xv. 32), and again that there were ‘prophets and teachers’ in the church at Antioch. (Acts xiii. 1.) These were not office bearers chosen by the congregation, but preachers raised up by the Spirit and conferred as gifts on the church. When Paul says (1 Cor. xii. 28; cf. Eph. iv. 11), ‘God has set some in the church, first, apostles; second, as prophets; third, as teachers,’ he points to a state of things which in his time prevailed in all the churches, both of Jewish and heathen origin. We here learn from Paul that the prophets occupied the second position in point of dignity; and we see from another passage (1 Cor. xiv.) that they were distinguished from the teachers by their speaking under the influence of in-

spiration,—not, however, like the ‘speakers in tongues,’ in unintelligible ejaculations and disconnected words, but in articulate, rational, edifying speech.

“Until recently it was impossible to form any distinct idea of the Christian prophets in the post-apostolic age, not so much from want of materials as because what evidence existed was not sufficiently clear and connected. It was understood, indeed, that they had maintained their places in the churches till the end of the second century, and that the great conflict with what is known as Montanism had first proved fatal to them, but a clear conception of their position and influence in the churches was not to be had. But the discovery by Bryennios, of the ancient Christian work, called *Διδαχῆτῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων*, has immensely extended the range of our knowledge. . . .

“The most important facts known at present about the manner of life, the influence, and history of the early Christian prophets are the following: (1.) Down to the close of the second century the prophets (or prophetesses) were regarded as an essential element in a church possessing the Holy Ghost. Their existence was believed in, and they did actually exist, not only in the Catholic congregations — if the expression may be used— but also in the Marcionite church and the Gnostic societies. Not a few Christian prophets are known to us by name; as Agabus, Judas, and Silas in Jerusalem; Barnabas, Simon Niger, etc., in Antioch; in Asia Minor, the daughters of Philip, Quadratus, Ammia, Polycarp, Meleto, Montanus, Maxmilla, Priscilla; in Rome, Hermas; among the followers of Basilides, Barkabbas and Barkop; in the community of Apelles, Philumene, etc.

“(2.) Till the middle of the second century the prophets were the regular preachers of the churches, without being attached to any particular congregation. While the ‘apostles’ (*i. e.*, itinerating missionaries) were obliged to preach from place to place, the prophets were at liberty either, like the teachers, to settle in a certain church, or travel from one to another. (3.) In the time of Paul the form of prophecy was reasoned exhortation in a state of inspiration; but very frequently the inspiration took the form of ecstasy—the prophet lost control of himself,

so that he did not remember afterwards what he had said. In the Gentile Christian churches, under the influence of pagan associations, ecstasy was the rule. (4.) With regard to the matter of prophecy, it might embrace anything that was necessary, or for the edification of the church. The prophets not only consoled and exhorted by the recital of what God had done and predictions of the future, but they uttered extempore thanksgivings to the congregational assemblies, and delivered special directions, which might extend to the most minute details, as, for example, the disposal of church funds. (5.) It was the duty of the prophets to follow in all respects the example of the Lord, and to put in practice what they preached. But an ascetic life was expected of them only when, like the apostles, they went about as missionaries, in which case the rules in Matt. x. applied to them. Whenever, on the contrary, they settled in a place, they had a claim to a liberal maintenance at the hands of the congregation. The author of the *Διδαχὴ* even compares them to the high priests of the Old Testament, and considers them entitled to the first fruits of the Levitical law. In reality, they might justly be compared to the priests, in so far as they were the mouthpieces of the congregation in public thanksgiving."—*Encyclopædia Britannica*, Vol. XIX., page 822.

## APPENDIX G.

## THE PRESIDENT OR CHIEF OFFICER IN THE CHURCH IN THE TIME OF THE APOSTLES. JAMES OR PETER, WHICH?

Since the publication of *Presidency and Priesthood*, in which the claim is made that James, the Lord's brother, was the chief or presiding officer in the church in the time of the apostles, various opinions have been passed and criticisms made in opposition to the position, and a theory has been advanced that Peter was the president and visible head of the church in his time. Chief among the publications attacking the position taken in *Presidency and Priesthood* is the *Appendix to the Exegesis of the Priesthood*, by Elder G. T. Griffiths, published in Cleveland, Ohio, 1902.

As truth,—and to ascertain the proper station or place in the organization of the church in the first century of these distinguished gospel workers,—is the object doubtless, of all the several critics and writers engaged in this research, and each seems quite willing to have his position tried in an open and fair manner, the final result must be good to the student and general reader, and the attainment by all of a more correct, scriptural view touching the question, than that which has heretofore been arrived at through the accumulated traditions of the past.

At the outset of this examination, note is taken of the alarm expressed by a few, of the doubt that must be cast upon the work of the body by the attitude of two prominent officers in the apostolic quorum engaging in a controversy over church matters, or church history. What an error! The church of Christ is founded in the principles of free and full discussion; open and fair examination and research, the successful foes of error and superstition whenever and wherever wielded, and it may well be said that the old ship of Zion is being guided safely when men and women are left free to think and canvass all questions pertaining to its cargo or voyage. It was from such a sure and divine basis

as this that the Apostle Paul could oppose in controversy the acts of the Apostle Peter, because, in his estimation of the case, "He [Peter] was to be blamed."—Galatians 2: 11.

It is true that the author of the Exegesis of the Priesthood sets forth his views with a hint at secure intrenchment, and that serene complacency that challenges criticism, but since these are not the most certain marks of correctness of position, it is eminently proper that Presidency and Priesthood should be heard in reply. It is unpleasant, however, to be forced into controversy with so good a friend as Elder Griffiths; but he has announced that he is "conscientious" in the matter, and as there may be others following conscientiously the same view held by him, the more important it becomes to continue the examination.

There being no Bible text that makes a clear statement in favor of either position, the truth can only be determined by a comparison of what is presented on either side in support of the respective claims, in regard to which every one is entitled to his or her opinion. Unfortunately the article of Elder Griffiths is lengthy, and written in such a manner as to require a lengthy reply; but those interested can afford to read, if we can afford to write.

There is nothing new in the claim that Peter was at the head. This simply follows in a general sense Rome and Utah; the former puts the church on Peter; and the latter puts Peter on the church. Hoary sentiment is to be met in regard to Peter in either case. The Bible puts Peter in the church. (1 Corinthians 12: 28.)

To begin with, the writer of the Appendix fortifies himself with a statement, said to have been made by Joseph Smith the Seer, found in the *Millennial Star* for 1855, pp. 310, 311, which makes him to say that "the Savior, Moses, and Elias, gave the keys to Peter, James, and John on the Mount when they were transfigured before him." So in the mind of the writer of the Appendix, these three were constituted a first presidency, upon the Mount. Which, if true, Jesus should have abdicated, or declined serving in that capacity longer, for it would appear unseemly or confusing



to have two sets of first presidents occupying at the same time and in so small a territory.

In the first place, Joseph could not have said anything of the kind as claimed in the light here presented, for it was not true; there is no fact to support such a presumption anywhere, and we prefer to say that he has been misstated. People will have to learn that even prophets must talk in harmony with facts as known, or they are not believed. Peter, James, and John were not "transfigured before him," as claimed. It was Jesus that was "transfigured." If Joseph ever said anything at all about this transaction, he certainly could not have been properly reported, and this is not singular, as there were no shorthand reporters to take it down, and only scraps and partial statements could have been secured at best.

This was published by the Utah people long after Joseph Smith's death. It is in harmony with their philosophy that the president of the Quorum of Twelve by right succeeds as the permanent president of the Church, so there is nothing strange that it is made to appear in the light it does, as it would be easy to read into it what was not said. The following shows that that could have occurred: "Since the death of the Prophet Joseph, the history has been carefully revised under the strict inspection of President Brigham Young, and approved by him." (History of the Church, by Utah Historian, page 5.) This will be sufficient as to the authority for our statement.

Second. There is no word upon record by either party who was upon the mount of transfiguration, that even hints that Peter, James, and John were either selected, received "keys," or were appointed or ordained to preside over the church. Peter, James, and John were present as witnesses on that occasion, and nothing more. Moses and Elias conversed with Jesus. It was Jesus that was both "transfigured" and administered unto upon the occasion. Moses and Elias "spoke of his decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem." The apostles were asleep on the ground much of the time, and what Peter did say he uttered not knowing what

he said. The apostles were afraid. Jesus had promised that they should see the "kingdom of God come in power." This they evidently did see, and were also shown how they were to put off this mortal tabernacle, by and by, and they heard the voice, "This is my beloved Son; . . . hear ye him." It was Jesus that received honor and glory, not Peter, James, and John. The apostles bore witness to what they did see, as on other occasions. They were witnesses, not presidents. (See 2 Peter 1: 17, 18; Matthew 17: 1-9; Mark 9: 27; Luke 9: 28-34; Acts 1: 8, 21, 22; 22: 32; 3: 15; 4: 20-23; 5: 33; 1 Peter 5: 1; 2 Peter 1: 16.)

Third. There was no call for Moses and Elias to appear in order to confer keys and authority on Peter, James, and John. Jesus was on earth and outranked them in every way. "When he bringeth his first begotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him."—Hebrews 1: 6; 1 Peter 3: 22. Christ could have constituted Peter, James, and John a presidency, had he been so minded, without the aid of either Moses or Elias, or even the transfiguration scene. That scene was for a very different purpose. Jesus had said, "Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom."—Matthew 16: 28. "And after six days, Jesus taketh Peter, James, and John, his brother, and bringeth them up into a high mountain apart, and was transfigured before them: and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light. And, behold there appeared unto them Moses and Elias, talking with him."—Matthew 17: 1-3. The power and coming of Jesus Christ was shown forth, his decease at Jerusalem foretold—how this mortal tabernacle is to be put off in death, the testimony of the Father to the fact that Jesus was the Son of God was renewed unto them, but not one word is said about the appointment of a presidency, ordination, or the bestowal of keys; all of this is assumed and worked in by those claiming Peter was at the head, without a single fact to support it.

Fourth. Just a few days after the transfiguration scene

was the time alluded to when the dispute arose among the twelve as to which should be the greatest. Had Peter, James, and John been selected, appointed, ordained, or received keys upon the Mount, as chief leaders and presidents, this gave them a fine opportunity to make known their rights. But no, they were silent about anything of the kind having taken place. When Jesus questioned them concerning the dispute had on the way, he, too, had forgotten all about the advancement of the three, the receiving of keys, or ordination on the Mount. Why did he not tell the disciples that this favored three had been selected, received keys, ordination, and appointment as a presidency, and thus for ever have settled the controversy? But no, he, too, was as silent about any such thing having occurred as the other three, for the evident reason that no such thing ever occurred upon the Mount or elsewhere. Moses and Elias did not appear on the Mount to create a presidency, by giving keys, ordaining or appointing a head over Jesus. It was Christ that received "honor and glory," and the testimony that Jesus was the Christ was renewed unto the apostles by the voice heard, "This is my beloved Son; . . . hear ye him." The apostles were witnesses, so Peter testified, "We were eye witnesses of his majesty."

Again, Moses and Elias, had they been so disposed, could not have set apart or ordained a presidency upon the Mount, by any known rule, and certainly they would not have done so by any unknown rule, or right of law or precedent. "Every president of the high priesthood . . . is to be ordained by the direction of a high council or general conference."—Doctrine and Covenants 17:17. Was there a general conference or high council called upon the Mount? The transfiguration scene will not support the contention or theory that Peter, James, and John were constituted a first presidency over the church at Jerusalem at the time of the Savior's transfiguration, for there were neither keys bestowed, appointment made, nor ordination received. Hence when the claim for the transfiguration scene is examined it fails to support the contention made for it.

It is true that Jesus said to Peter, "And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven."—Matthew 16:19. But Jesus evidently intended that the others of the twelve should share in this authority as well as Peter, although Peter was the one named in the address. Jesus addressed them all when he put his question, Peter answering as was common for him to do, and no doubt his answer was theirs also. The full meaning of what the Savior said may be seen in his statement to the twelve after his resurrection: "Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you: as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained."—John 20:21-23. This referred to the power conferred on the apostles to qualify them to carry out the commission to be given them, set forth in Mark 16:15: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature."

The same view is presented when the twelve in this last dispensation were authorized; the instruction is as follows: "Verily, thus saith the Lord *unto you* my servant, Thomas, I have heard thy prayers, and thine alms have come up as a memorial before me, in behalf of those thy *brethren* who were chosen to bear testimony of my name, and to *send it abroad among all nations, kindreds, tongues, and people*; and ordained through the instrumentality of my servants. . . . Let thy heart be of good cheer before my face, and thou shalt bear record of my name, not only unto the Gentiles, but also unto the Jews; and *thou shalt send forth my words unto the ends of the earth*. . . . Now, I say unto you, —and *what I say unto you I say unto all the twelve*,—Arise and gird up your loins, *take up your cross, follow me and feed my sheep*."—Doctrine and Covenants 105:1-6. This disposes of the idea that no one was to feed the "sheep" but Peter. But we read further: "and again I say unto you,

that whosoever ye shall send in my name, *by the voice of your brethren, the twelve, duly recommended and authorized by you shall have power to open the door of my kingdom unto any nation whithersoever ye shall send them,*" etc.—Ibid., paragraph 8. It really looks as though the twelve hold some "keys of the kingdom" and can represent that kingdom abroad, as well as at home, and all within the meaning of the phrase ("as pertaining to the twelve") that is set out as having such restricted meaning in the Appendix.

The Lord, speaking of this authority, says, "But purify your hearts before me, and then go ye into all the world, and preach my gospel unto every creature who has not received it, and he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not, and is not baptized, shall be damned. For unto you (the twelve), and those (the first presidency), who are appointed *with you* to be your counselors and your leaders, is the *power of this priesthood given, for the last days* and for the last time, in the which is the dispensation of the fullness of times, which power *you hold* in connection with all those who have received a dispensation at any time from the beginning of the creation; for verily I say unto *you*, the *keys* of the dispensation which *ye have received*, have come down from the fathers; and last of all being sent down from heaven unto *you*. Verily I say unto you, Behold *how great is your calling!*"—Ibid., paragraphs 11, 12, and 13. (The italics are mine to call special attention of reader.) There are "keys," a "calling," and authority enough here bestowed for Peter and associates ("as pertaining to the twelve"), or any one else to bear the keys of the kingdom of heaven, in the full sense set out in the Scriptures, and, too, without being first presidents of the church or their being changed from the apostolic quorum. That there may be no mistake about the authority, power, and keys conferred upon the church in both ancient and modern times, and those who hold these keys, we cite the following: "The *Melchisedec priesthood* holds the right of presidency, and has *power and authority over all the offices*

in the church, in all ages of the world, to administer in spiritual things.”—Ibid., 104: 3.

Who holds this authority in chief? Answer: “For unto *you* (the twelve), and those (the first presidency, who are appointed *with you*, to be your counselors and your leaders, is the power of this priesthood given for the last days and for the last time,” etc.—Ibid., 105: 12. Again, “the twelve traveling counselors are called to be the twelve apostles, or special witnesses of the name of Christ, in all the world; thus differing from other officers in the church in the duties of their calling. And *they* form a quorum *equal* in authority and power to the three presidents previously mentioned.”—Ibid., 104: 11. Also, “The twelve are a traveling, presiding high council, to officiate in the name of the Lord, under the direction of the presidency of the church and regulate all the affairs of the same, in all nations; first unto the Gentiles, and secondly unto the Jews.”—Ibid., paragraph 12. The Lord counseled the twelve, “Exalt not yourselves; rebel not against my servant Joseph, for verily I say unto you, I am with him, and my hand shall be over him, and the *keys* which I have given unto him, and also to *youward*, shall not be taken from him till I come.”—Ibid., 105: 6. In the distribution of “keys” thus conferred, Thomas B. Marsh is set forth as favored as was Peter: “Verily I say unto you, my servant Thomas, thou art the man whom I have chosen to hold the *keys* of *my kingdom* (as pertaining to the twelve) *abroad among all nations*, that thou mayest be my servant to unlock the *door* of *my kingdom* in all places where my servant Joseph, and my servant Sidney, and my servant Hyrum, can not come; for on them I have laid the burden of all the churches for a little season; wherefore, whithersoever they shall send you, go ye, and I will be with you,” etc.—Ibid., paragraph 7. No one need fail to see the similarity of keys, authority, and commission here conferred upon Thomas B. Marsh and associates, and that which was given to Peter and companions at Jerusalem (Matthew 16: 19; John 20: 23). Alike keys, authority, and commission—not as a presidency, but to travel in all the world.

Section 80, paragraph 1, Doctrine and Covenants is cited by the opposition: "Unto whom I have given the keys of the kingdom, which belongeth always unto the presidency of the high priesthood." Certainly; but who constitutes the "presidency of the high priesthood"? Answer: "For unto you (the twelve) and those (the first presidency) who are appointed with you, to be your counselors and your leaders, is the power of this priesthood given, for the last days and for the last time, in the which is the dispensation of the fullness of times, which power you hold in connection with all those who have received a dispensation at any time from the beginning of creation; for verily I say unto you, The keys of the dispensation which you have received (the twelve and first presidency), have come down from the fathers; and last of all, being sent down from heaven unto you."—Ibid., 105:12. Again, "The quorums in respect to authority are designed to take precedence in office as follows: . . . the parallels are: in the presidency, the president and his counselors; in the second presidency, the twelve; in the missionary work, first the twelve."—Ibid., 122:9. The keys were conveyed to this second presidency, as follows: "And the keys which I have given unto him, and also to *youward*, shall not be taken from him till I come." So there is a distribution of keys and authority; the first presidency hold the keys "pertaining" to it; and the second presidency hold the keys "pertaining" to it; and all keys held by either presidency are "keys of the kingdom." These two presidencies constitute the "presidency of the high priesthood;" not to mention the seventies and others who hold keys. It will be readily seen that there are "keys of the kingdom" involved here that "pertain" to the second presidency of the "high priesthood," that answer to every point of power and "keys" that were conferred on Peter, without an implication or hint that he was to be appointed a member of the quorum of the first presidency. Hence section 80 of Doctrine and Covenants does not prove nor sustain "emphatically," that Peter, James, and John were constituted a first presidency over the church at Jerusalem. Their calling and com-

mission forbid it. Their constant labors abroad forbid it. Peter and associates constituted the second presidency. Christ was the first president, and after his ascension another was chosen. So we read: "Of necessity, there are presidents, or presiding offices, growing out of, or appointed of, or from among those who are ordained to the several offices in these two priesthoods. Of the Melchisedec priest-hood, three presiding high priests, *chosen by the body*, appointed and ordained to that office," etc.—Ibid., 104: 11. Clement represents it thus: "Peter, James, and John, after the ascension of our Savior, though they had been preferred by our Lord, did not contend for the honor, but chose James the Just as bishop of Jerusalem."—Eusebius' History, p. 37. Hegesippus, who lived nearest the time of the apostles, in the fifth book of his commentaries, says: "But James, the brother of the Lord, who, as there were many of this name, was surnamed the Just by all, from the days of our Lord until now, received the government of the church with the apostles."—Ibid., p. 64.

It is also claimed: "That this was designed as a peculiar honor to Saint James, in regard that he was the brother of Christ."—Antiquities of Christianity, p. 58; Christian Antiquities, by Bingham, vol. 1, p. 16. "For nothing is plainer," says Reverend J. W. Harding, D. D., "than that, Saint James, the apostle (whom Saint Paul calls 'our Lord's brother' and reckoned with Peter and John one of the pillars of the church), was the same who presided among the apostles by his episcopal office, and determined the cause in the synod of Jerusalem. *He was preferred before all the rest for his near relationship to Christ.*"—Sacred Biography and History, p. 522. "That this James was the James who was named with Joses, Simon, and Judas, as one of our Lord's brethren, must be *received as certain*. But whether he was identical with James, the son of Alphæus, who was one of the twelve, is a question much discussed, and on which eminent biblical scholars are found arrayed on opposite sides."—Pictorial Bible, by David C. Cook & Co., Chicago, Illinois. The children of Joseph and Mary were Jesus,



James, Joses, Jude (Judas), Simon, and three daughters whose names were not given. (Matthew 13:55, 56; Galatians 1:19; 2:9, 12.) His brethren did not believe in Jesus as the Christ at first (John 7:5), and some of them not until a few days before the day of Pentecost (1 Corinthians 15:7). James occupied a prominent position among the apostles, and was surnamed "the Just." James and Peter seem to have been in authority on equal terms when Paul was admitted to the fellowship of the apostles on the word of Barnabas (Acts 9:17; Galatians 1:18), and after that time he acts as the president of the council in Jerusalem (Acts 12:17; 15:13), whose decrees he delivered formally, a position recognized and recorded by Paul (Galatians 2:9), and honored by a formal visit of ceremony in the presence of all the presbyteries (Acts 21:18). "He is believed to have been appointed bishop of Jerusalem by Jesus in a vision, . . . Eusebius says the appointment was by the apostles." (Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, p. 143, published at 1222 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1883.)

These eminent writers are quoted in evidence that it was not Peter, James, and John that presided over the church at Jerusalem, but James the Lord's brother. This is the main point presented in these references. As to whether this James was the son of Alphæus or the Lord's brother, the son of Joseph and Mary, or was an "apostle," will be discussed further on. These writers view it as certain that this James was the president at Jerusalem. It is clear, too, that this James could not be the son of Alphæus, because the son of Alphæus was chosen as one of the original apostles (Matthew 10), and this James did not believe in Jesus at that time (Matthew 13:55; John 7:3), and it would be ridiculous to assume that Jesus placed a man who did not believe in him in the apostolic quorum. We shall produce further evidence from the writings of eminent authors that it was James that was constituted the president at Jerusalem, and that he was not the son of Alphæus, nor did he belong to the college of apostles. It should be borne in mind that this theory that obtained, that James the Lord's brother

was the son of Alphæus, was an "invention" of Jerome, three hundred and fifty years after the time of Christ, presumably to cater to the Romish sentiment that Mary was "ever virgin"; a theory which has been the fruitful source of darkening counsel by all writers holding Romish views and superstitions in regard to the office and work of Peter. Later and better informed writers, who are further removed from Romish superstitions and traditions, present the matter in a better light, and more nearly in harmony with the scriptural view, as may be seen by a careful reading. George T. Pures, D. D., LL. D., recently Professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis, in Princeton Theological Seminary, author of "Christianity in the Apostles' Age," writes (page 16): "Christianity originated in the appearance among the Jews of Jesus Christ, and especially from the belief in his Messiahship created by the events of his career, his teaching, and unique personality. The Gospels show that the immediate object of Jesus during his life was twofold. On the one hand, he offered himself to the Jews as one who had come from God to establish the kingdom of heaven, inveighed against current Judaisms as a false interpretation of God's commands, and summoned the people to accept him as the revealer of the true religious life. On the other hand, foreseeing from the start their rejection of him (see John 2: 19; 3: 11, 14, 19; Luke 4: 24-27; Matthew 8: 10, 12; 12: 39, 41; Luke 11: 49-51; Matthew 9: 15; John 6: 51-56; Matthew 16: 21-23, etc.), he addressed himself to the task of attaching to himself and his teaching a nucleus of believers who should carry on, after his death, the establishment of the kingdom. But he did not organize them into a separate society, save by the appointment of twelve apostles. These he constituted his personal representatives and the official heads of the new Israel (Matthew 10: 40; Mark 3: 14, 15; Matthew 17: 19; 18: 18; 19: 28; Mark 10: 37; Luke 22: 29, 30); but he attempted no further organization."

Page 11: "The apostles were the official witnesses (Acts 1: 22; 10: 41; 1 Corinthians 9: 1; 4: 5-8; John 21: 14), though their testimony was confirmed by that of many others.

... Peter, the most conspicuous witness in Acts,—the appearance of Jesus to whom is specifically mentioned by Luke (24:34) and Paul (1 Corinthians 15:7),—never represents it as resting on his own testimony or that of any other individual, but on that of all the apostles." (See for example, Acts 2:32; 3:15; 10:41.)

Page 17: "The apostles returned from Jerusalem from their Lord's ascension, to wait for the promised Spirit, . . . the company, however, comprised more than the eleven apostles. Mention is made of certain women, who were perhaps wives of the disciples or others mentioned as witnesses of the resurrection, with perhaps still others who, like Mary and Martha of Bethany, had been followers of Jesus. . . . The mother of Jesus also belonged to the company, and with her were his brethren. The latter had not believed in his Messiahship even towards the close of his life (John 7:5). But to one of them, James, he had appeared after his resurrection (1 Corinthians 15:7), and doubtless this, with the other evidence, had secured their faith." It will be noted that this doubting James, according to the theory set forth in the Appendix to the Exegesis, was placed as one of the original apostles, as the son of Alphæus, which is absurd upon the face of it. His brethren did not believe in him, no matter whose children they were. After reciting the setting apart of Matthias to the apostleship, this writer continues, on page 23, "His [Peter's] conduct, therefore, shows that it was recognized by all that the new community had been organized by Christ under the direction of the body of apostles. Peter's prominence indicates neither that he occupied a position of primacy, nor that the authority of the apostolic body as a whole did not yet exist. His words imply quite the contrary. He was simply the most active leader of the governing body. The power of further organization had also been, it is clear, left by Christ with his disciples." Referring to further organization, page 41, he says, "The complaint of the Hellenists, however, suggested to the apostles the necessity of some arrangement to meet the difficulty; and this was accomplished in a way that satisfied

all parties and harmonized with the supremacy of the apostles and the rights of the community. Seven men were chosen by the brethren and were set apart to the work by the imposition of hands of the apostles. Thus the apostles again appear as the authoritative founders of the church, whose special function, however, was teaching. The advance in organization, it should be noted, was brought about by the pressure of practical needs and without reference to any previous program. The whole congregation was recognized as having the right to choose their officials." Page 96: "Thus must be explained the origin of the Christian office of elder. No specific account of its institution is given. We simply find it existing; but there can be no question that it was copied from the office of the same name among the Jews. In each Jewish community the elders were the governing body." Speaking of the apostles, page 95, "But they now appear more and more to have directed their efforts to the superintendence and advancement of the cause at large. So Peter's activity, quite early in this period, is expressly described. (Acts 9: 32.) So, too, had Paul, as we have seen, been sent forth to Selicia. From this time forth we hear no more of most of the original apostles. We can not doubt that they *went abroad* as tradition affirms (Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, book 3, chapter 1) as missionaries and founders of new churches." Page 96: "Jerusalem indeed continued for many years to be headquarters of the faith, and to it they may have returned like Paul himself from time to time. But the progress and organization of the Judean churches appears to have delocalized the apostles and made it a traveling and scattered body, delivering in wider circles the gospel of the risen Lord."

It will be observed that Peter was no exception to this scattering: "And it came to pass, as Peter passed throughout all quarters, he came down also to the saints which dwelt at Lydda." It was thus while Peter was passing "throughout all quarters" that he was directed to the house of Cornelius. (Acts 9 and 10.) Peter is not president of the church here; he is simply out on a mission, and in the

community where he was chief laborer as an apostle, he is sent to Cornelius. The apostles all scattered abroad now, Peter included, we ought to soon find some leading character in charge of the church at home, the headquarters. So this writer goes on, page 130, "After the Herodian persecution (A. D. 44) the most conspicuous individual among the Palestinian Christians was James 'the Lord's brother'" (Galatians 1:19; compare Galatians 2:9; Acts 12:17; 15:13; 21:18; Matthew 13:55; Mark 6:3; Josephus' *Antiquities* 29:1; Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*, book 2, chapter 23). He is not to be identified with the apostle James, the son of Alphæus, for the brethren of the Lord are distinguished by the evangelists from the apostles. (Matthew 12:46; John 7:3, 5; Acts 1:14.) Paul's language (Galatians 1:19; 1 Corinthians 15:7) has indeed been thought to imply that James was an apostle, and the hypothesis has been advanced, that after the death of James, the son of Zebedee (Acts 12:2); the brother of the Lord was chosen to fill his place. Others think that in these passages Paul, contrary to the usual custom, uses the term "apostle" in a loose sense. But his language does not impel either of these interpretations. That in Galatians 1:19 James is not necessarily to be included among the apostles is shown by the example of other sentences similarly constructed (see Romans 14; Luke 4:26); while in 1 Corinthians 15:7 the order of words in the original would seem to imply that James is rather distinguished from those included among them. As already observed, also, it is questionable whether he was meant to be included among the apostles by Luke in Acts 2:27. Certainly apart from these very doubtful witnesses, he is not called an apostle; and what is most significant, he does not so call himself in his epistle. It is more likely that after the apostolate had become delocalized by the progress of the organization of the Judean churches, James, who remained in Jerusalem, became the practical head of the Jewish Christians, and this leadership, on account of his personal character and high spiritual gifts, rather than because of any office held by him, became so marked

that he exerted an influence equal to that of the apostles themselves (Galatians 2:9), and was remembered in after times as the head of the mother church. (Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, book 2, chapter 1.)

At any rate the prominence and influence of James are beyond dispute. Peter, when fleeing from imprisonment, sent word of his escape to "James and brethren." (Acts 12:17.) At the council at Jerusalem James' opinion had decisive weight. (Acts 15:12, 21.) It was "certain from James" whose presence at Antioch led Peter to withdraw from fellowship with the Gentiles. (Galatians 2:12.) On Paul's final return to Jerusalem it was James and the elders who received him. (Acts 21:18.) The epistle witnesses to the authority and wide influence of its writer; and the author of Jude introduced himself to his readers as the brother of James. (Jude 1.) To this may be added the testimony of secular history and tradition. Josephus (Antiquities 20, 9, 1) relates that after the recall of Festus A. D. 62, the high priest Annus secured the stoning of James, the brother of Jesus, and some others, on the ground that they had broken the law, but that the better citizens complained of the act, so that in consequence Annus was removed from office by Agrippa II. The respect in which James was held by the whole city is attested by traditions. Hegesippus relates (Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, book 2, chapter 23) that he was known as the "Just" and as the bulwark of the people; that he lived the life of a Nazarite; that he had a high reputation for piety of a rather ascetic type. But the evidence wherever we find it, discloses a man of large influence, impressive character, and intense piety according to the finest Hebrew ideals; one, therefore, most likely to attain to leadership among the Jewish disciples. (Page 132.)

"In order to form a still clearer image of James, we must go back to the Nazarene home in which Jesus was reared. The 'brethren of the Lord' were either the children of Joseph by a former marriage, or the children of Joseph and Mary born after Jesus. The latter view seems best to accord with the intimations of the gospels. The view advanced by Jerome

and elaborated by others that they were the cousins of Jesus on his mother's side is beset with difficulties, of which it is sufficient to mention the fact that it identified James with the son of Alphæus and so makes him one of the original apostles."—Page 133.

"There is still less foundation for the view that they were cousins of Jesus on Joseph's side. In any event James had been the daily associate of Jesus in the Nazarene home. We infer that from early life he had been an earnest, religious character, steeped in the teaching of the Old Testament and in later Hebrew literature. The tradition of his devoted piety can hardly have been without some foundation, yet with all of his piety James did not accept Jesus as the Messiah. This does not exclude, however, sympathy with much of Jesus' teaching, nor warm affection for his person. His unbelief may have been due to Jesus' rupture with many Jewish conventionalities; also to James' exalted view of the glory of the Messiah, and the impression of Jesus' loneliness produced on one who had himself shared it. The fact that Jesus, after his resurrection, appeared to James (1 Corinthians 4:7) is a testimony to the latter's high character as well as his brother's love for him and foresight of his future usefulness.

"We can not wonder, then, that when convinced of the Messiahship of his former brother and now risen Lord, James soon ranked high in the new community. It is not clear what office he occupied in the Jerusalem church. Later traditions made him its first bishop, chosen to that office by the apostles (Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, 2, 23); and among extreme Jewish Christians of the second century, he was represented as the bishop of the entire church. (Church Homilies.) But these traditions read back later ideas into the apostolic age. He was doubtless one of the elders of the church; and if the eldership of Jerusalem had a president—of which there is no proof—James presumably held that office."—Page 134.

This is all that might be expected to be conceded by one who does not believe in the idea of a first president or first presidency. It is clear, however, that James was the *prominent* man in Jerusalem, which is enough to support our

contention, and that this James *was not the son of Alphæus*. True, the name of the office he held is not recorded; but in after-years when the word *bishop* was used to dignify the highest church official, or designate his office, it was read back and the same title or office was accorded to James the Lord's brother, in speaking of him. The above citations are given from this eminent scholar and author, for the reason he discusses the questions at issue quite fully, and certainly fairly; and he is an up to date man. His treatise from which these selections have been made is a rare work, of value to any student. It will be observed that after the ascension of Jesus, the completion of the organization of the church was left to the apostles as a body. That when the church was supplied with competent local officers and set in order, the twelve were "delocalized" and went into all the world. That the organization was kept up in Jerusalem and its authority was recognized everywhere. That Peter held no preëminence other than the president of the quorum over the other apostles; they acted together. That "James, the Lord's brother," by proper selection and choice became the recognized head or president of the church at Jerusalem. As to his prominence there is no dispute. That Peter's preëminence appears nowhere more than when Jesus was on earth with the disciples, and it could hardly be claimed that Peter outranked Jesus in official standing. That James "the Lord's brother" was the son of Joseph and Mary, is the most probable view, and that he could not have been the son of Alphæus. That the theory that James, Joses, etc., were cousins of Jesus, and not brothers, was an "invention" by Jerome over three hundred and fifty years after the time of Christ; that this was gotten up most likely to harmonize with the Roman Catholic sentiment and claims of the times, that the church was built on Peter and that Mary was "ever virgin," etc. So the contention made by the writer of the Appendix to the Exegesis of the Priesthood is shown to be without foundation in the main view presented.

But the evidences are extended.

"I am led by close examination of evidence to the con-



viction that James, the son of Alphæus, and James, who is styled in Galatians 1: 19 the brother of the Lord, were different persons (see John 7: 3; Matthew 13: 55). The former was an apostle; the latter does not seem even to have been a believer in Christ at all till after the resurrection. Immediately on his joining the little Christian church, however, he took a prominent position, being president of the council at Jerusalem. It is my opinion, from the statements made in Scripture, that James was the son of Joseph and Mary; and consequently, as stated by Paul, the brother of our Lord. He was the author of the epistle."—From the Self Interpreting Bible, under the head of the General Epistle of James, page 480.

Again, page 512, the following occurs:

"Had the author of this epistle (Epistle of Jude) been the same as Judas Lebbeus, one of the twelve, there is scarcely a doubt that he would have called himself an apostle. This would at once have given his epistle the stamp of authority. As he has not done so, it seems in the highest degree probable that he was not an apostle, and that James mentioned as his brother was the well-known president of the council at Jerusalem and author of the epistle that bears his name. Jude was then one of the brethren (or as I believe, a brother of the Lord).—From notes in the Self Interpreting Bible by Reverend James W. Lee, D. D., Josiah L. Porter, D. D., LL. D., Henry Cook, D. D., LL. D., John Brown, D. D., LL. D., published by R. S. Peale and J. A. Hill, New York."

These writers rank among the most eminent scholars in Europe and America. In point of scholarship there is no better authority.

It will be noted that these writers take the same view in regard to the brother of the Lord, Jude and the son of Alphæus, that is presented in Presidency and Priesthood. In Tell's Popular Encyclopedia, page 1363, under the head of James, the following occurs:

"James the son of Alphæus, one of the twelve apostles (Matthew 10: 3; Mark 3: 18; Luke 6: 15; Acts 1: 13). He is called James the less, either as being younger than James

the son of Zebedee or on account of his low stature (Mark 16: 1; Luke 24: 10). James the brother of the Lord (Galatians 1: 18). Whether this James is identical with the son of Alphæus is a question which Doctor Neander pronounces to be the most difficult in the apostolic history, and can not be considered as settled. It is probable however that he was a different person."

It will be observed, however, that all of the eminent authors cited above, place the *probabilities* of this question upon the side that they were two distinct persons; and some take strong grounds, being convinced that the brother of the Lord was not the son of Alphæus, but none other than the son of Joseph and Mary and brother of Jesus as affirmed by Paul. But it may be important to examine this Appendix to the Exegesis of the Priesthood more minutely.

On the second page, the writer endeavors to convince his readers about a matter concerning which there is no dispute, viz., "that Peter, James (the son of Zebedee), and John were the messengers sent to Joseph Smith, the Seer, and Oliver Cowdery, and that John the Baptist acted under their direction," also the quotation from Doctrine and Covenants 110: 20 in regard to the "voice of Michael on the banks of the Susquehanna," etc. There is no difficulty about these texts,—it is only the conclusions arrived at by the writer that mystifies, and gets him into trouble. He says, page 145, "Now if there was a James, the Lord's brother, who held the keys of the presidency subsequent to Christ's departure, why did not he and his associates Jude and Silas, as stated by some, appear and confer the keys of the presidency upon Joseph Smith?" We answer, for the best of reasons. Neither James, Jude, and Silas, nor Peter, James, and John were directing the matter. Jesus Christ, the great Head of the church in heaven, was doing the sending. The Savior sent the men whom he selected for his special ambassadors at Jerusalem, and gave commission to "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature;" and again, "and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Jesus had said unto them in similar speech which was ad-

dressed to Thomas B. Marsh, "Unto you three I will give this power and the keys of this ministry until I come." (Doctrine and Covenants 7: 2.) The keys of this ministry related to the *preaching of the gospel* and bringing souls unto Christ, as the context shows, home and foreign missions, and has not the least allusion to a presidency on earth. It referred to their work in the ministry in this world, and their standing and work in heaven when they should become angels, next to Christ, his prime ministers to be sent. These keys were to be held by them until Christ comes, then they are to appear on thrones (Matthew 19: 28), not as presidents, but as judges. So their authority and work are set out on earth, in heaven, and in the millennium, standing next to Christ as chief ministers, not church presidents. Again, it is nowhere written that one first presidency is to send another first presidency, and most especially this would be true if the work in view had been assigned to others to do. Jesus, the great First President, sent three of his apostles according to law and order; and not the presidency of the church at Jerusalem, or any other church; but men to whom this work belonged, under the direction of the First President in heaven. Jesus was always careful to keep the law on his side.

The writer of the Appendix, then, is not supported in his theory by this text. The trouble with the Exegesis is that it does not sufficiently set out the proper presidency that belongs to the "high priesthood," which consists of a presidency and a second presidency; and then the keys held by the second presidency are made to belong only to the first. But sections 104, 105, 80, Doctrine and Covenants, made clear the places of the two, arranging each presidency in its place with its proper "keys of the kingdom," or keys of the Melchisedec priesthood. The second presidency are the messengers sent. So Jesus, the great Head and President in heaven, sent those to whom he gave the keys of this ministry, under whose direction the Aaronic priesthood was conferred upon Joseph Smith, Jr., and Oliver Cowdery by the imposition of the hands of John the Baptist, and the Mel-

chisedec by the command of God through the laying on of hands of Joseph Smith upon Oliver Cowdery, and Oliver Cowdery in turn laying his hands upon Joseph Smith; after which, Joseph says, "I should be called the first elder, and he (Oliver) the second." There was nothing conferred here but what is admitted that Peter, James, and John were invested with at Jerusalem, during Christ's ministry on earth, and also their associates; only now, these three are empowered with an increased authority, that is, a dispensation of the gospel for the last time and the fullness of times, showing that they had received new keys since becoming angels. Peter, James, and John, John the Baptist, and Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery, were all instruments through which these ordinations occurred and priesthoods were bestowed, but it was Jesus Christ who did the ordaining. Jesus says, "by whom I have ordained you and confirmed you to be apostles and special witnesses of my name, and bear the keys of your ministry." Nothing but the admitted authority held by Peter, James, and John, as apostles, at Jerusalem, is here indicated as having been conferred; but had there been other, that authority and the keys could have been bestowed by the great Head who sent them, just as well as he could confer on them the authority and keys of the dispensation of the fullness of times, that perhaps none will claim they held at Jerusalem, whatever their place in the church.

When the church had been sufficiently organized, so as to require a permanent local president, it was provided for according to law, as shown in the revelations already quoted, viz.:

"Of necessity there are presidents, or presiding offices, growing out of, or appointed of, or from among those who are ordained to the several offices of these two priesthoods. Of the Melchisedec priesthood, three presiding high priests, chosen by the body, appointed and ordained to that office, and upheld by the confidence, faith and prayers of the church."—Doctrine and Covenants 104:11.

This is the course that was pursued by the apostles and

church at Jerusalem after the ascension of the Savior. Peter, James, and John "did not contend for the honor as to who should occupy the highest seat, but chose James the Just as bishop of Jerusalem." As a second step, after the death of James, it is written:

"Sometime after his death, as Eusebius relates from ancient traditions, the apostles and disciples of our Lord, as many as were yet in being, met together with our Savior's kinsmen (several of whom were alive) to consult about choosing a successor in Saint James' room, and they unanimously agreed upon Simeon, son of Cleopas, our Savior's cousin according to the flesh, thinking him the most fit and worthy person." —Antiquities of Christianity, p. 28.

This "choosing" of a president of the church at Jerusalem is in harmony with the rule as cited in the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, but who ever read anything about Peter, James, and John being "chosen" as presidents of the church? According to this law and precedent, Joseph Smith, Jr., was "chosen" president of the Church, and ordained at a conference held at Amherst, Ohio, and, too, ordained by those holding a like priesthood with himself, thus refuting the claim made by some, that in every case of ordination, the one receiving ordination must be set apart by one holding a higher office in the priesthood than the one being ordained. If there is a higher officer present or available, he is considered and recognized, otherwise a commandment from God to ordain is the end of controversy. This is what occurred in the chamber of old Father Whitmer, and what occurred at Amherst, Ohio; the stream never rises above the fountain, for the fountain is in heaven; men are "ordained by the power of the Holy Ghost which is in the one who ordains." So in referring to Joseph and Oliver, the Savior is made to say, "Whom I have ordained."

On page 3 of the Appendix, reference is made to Peter, James, and John going with the Savior upon the Mount, of their being permitted to enter the sick room (Luke 8:13), and selected to be with Christ during his trial at Gethsemane (Matthew 26:37, 38), and all of this is made to bend to the

notion that these experiences were for the purpose of fitting them for the presidency of the church. But the references do not warrant the conclusion. They were present as witnesses. Christ in answering his accusers, said, "Ask those who heard me," "In secret have I said nothing." The transfiguration scene claim has been already noticed and refuted, however.

Further on, the writer of the Appendix is disturbed over the number of Jameses mentioned in the New Testament, and states:

"If the Lord had a brother James in the flesh, then there were three who held the apostleship, viz.: First, James the son of Zebedee and the brother of John; second, James the son of Alphæus (see Matthew 10:2, 3); third, James the Lord's brother and son of Joseph (see Galatians 1:19), and in paragraph 19 he says, 'James, the son of Zebedee, was slain by Herod, about 44 A. D.' (see Acts 12:2). When and where was James the son of Alphæus slain? This must be shown to get the matter as claimed, beyond question. If his death can not be accounted for, how can it be construed that every quotation containing the name of James, after the year 44 A. D., refers to James, the Lord's brother?"

In reply, we say we know of no such claim being made that every passage containing the name James after 44 A. D. refers to James the Lord's brother. It may be, however. As an explanation they could refer to James the Lord's brother just as well as James the son of Alphæus, if it be true there is but one referred to. "The son of Alphæus is only named in the four lists of apostles."—*Britannica*, p. 552, vol. 13. It is not necessary, however, that we show the death of the son of Alphæus in order to clear up the matter. The case is clearly made without this. First, we avoid the inconsistency of making James the son of Alphæus the president of the church at Jerusalem, as he was one of the twelve apostles. James the Lord's brother did not belong to the quorum of apostles at any time. Second, when the son of Alphæus was chosen one of the twelve, James the Lord's brother did not believe in Jesus as the Messiah, and it is impossible that Jesus

would select an unbeliever for a place among the other believing apostles. When Jesus was born it was announced that he was Mary's "firstborn"; and it would be very inconsistent for the historian to speak of a "firstborn," had there not been a second. See also the discussion of this in the main evidence by others in this article.

No "figurehead" is made of the son of Alphæus either; he simply stands in his own place as do the other members of the twelve, and always will in this world and the one to come. He went abroad as his calling required of him, as did the others, and most likely was finally slain, as others were, for the testimony he bore, a reliable account of which we do not have—nor do we have of but few, if any, of the other apostles.

In regard to the Oxford Teacher's Bible and Wilson's Emphatic Diaglott, they likely teach just as claimed, but what of it? Oxford is so close to Rome in tradition and sentiment that she could not be expected to reflect but the current traditional sentiment, the "inventions" of Jerome of the fourth century, gotten up long after the actual occurrences and under the flavor of the Roman Catholic claims of power through Peter as the head, and are of a piece with the theory of the immaculate conception of Mary, that she was a goddess, and all who are saved, are saved only by means of this divine mother, etc. Their value is no more, so far as deciding the question is concerned, than the statement of Jerome, which, unsupported, is too shaky to base anything of fact upon.

On page 147 the writer says:

"In Acts 12:17 we read, 'But he (Peter) beckoning unto them with the hand to hold their peace, declared unto them how the Lord had brought him out of the prison, and he said, Go show these things unto James (son of Alphæus) and to the brethren.' Here Peter recognizes James the son of Alphæus as prominent among the apostles in the year 44 A. D., and shortly after the death of James the son of Zebedec. This same James, in connection with Peter, presided at Jerusalem in the year 52. (See Acts 15:13.) This could not have been James, the Lord's brother, because we find that

six years later (Galatians 1:19) James, the Lord's brother, was only called 'an apostle,' which shows conclusively that he was not yet 'chief apostle' nor 'president.'"

It is a little amusing to note how our author manages to inject into the passages cited, "son of Alphæus, as though he had settled the matter. It reminds one of the story of the smart boy at the cornhusking, who claimed he could squeeze cider out of cotton. When challenged, he just dipped the cotton into the cider, so it was no difficult task to squeeze it out. He first put it in. That is the way the writer of the Appendix gets the son of Alphæus into these texts; he just puts it in. But this is the point to be proven. How quick and easy our author fills up the vacancy caused by the death of James the son of Zebedee, with the appointment of the son of Alphæus. If this were true, what becomes of all his claim about Peter, James, and John being upon the mountain; in the sick room; at Gethsemane, etc., in order to make church presidents of them? The son of Alphæus was not of these favored three; but if these experiences were essential to their election as the first presidents, they would be for him also. But he was not so favored. Acts 12:17 does not read, then, as set out in the Exegesis, and the insertion by the author of the words "the son of Alphæus" is a blunder of the worst kind. Again, whoever heard anything about Peter and James presiding at Jerusalem? (Acts 4.) This is more cider in the cotton. Again, page 147, it is stated that "James the son of Zebedee was killed in 44 A. D. James the son of Alphæus must have presided at Jerusalem in connection with Peter, 52 A. D., as James, the Lord's brother, is still called 'an apostle' when Paul went up to Jerusalem in the year 58 A. D."

But the theory here presented makes the son of Alphæus and the Lord's brother the same person, which is not correct, as we have shown. It would be quite as easy of explanation by assuming that it was James the Lord's brother who presided at Jerusalem. So it is not "conclusive" that he was not president for twenty-five years after the ascension, etc.



But as this is answered elsewhere it is not necessary to further consider it here.

On page 148, what is said of the Emphatic Diaglott and other matters is of a piece with what has already been answered in a general way. Why Jesus used the language he did while on the cross, to John, in connection with his mother, is not stated. If he intended to put her in John's care, he evidently had a good reason for it, whether she had children or not. We have read somewhere that John had means and a home; if so, this may account for it. Jesus loved John and his mother, and in a gospel sense, they were mother and son (Matthew 13: 48, 50). Jesus knew and likely his mother knew—that she would be safest with John. The "opinion embraced by Augustine, and by the majority of the Romanists and Protestants," is of the same class that has been considered.

But the author of the Appendix goes on: "There is but one statement in the Bible where it is said, James, the Lord's brother, viz.: Galatians 1:19, nor is there any reference whatever made to him in the revelations of the latter days."

Well, this is interesting. There *is one* place in the Bible where James is called the Lord's brother; but there is not even *one* place where it says he was not his brother. It appears, therefore, that the evidence is decidedly in favor of James being the brother of the Lord. But James' name does not occur in "the latter-day revelations." Does that of the son of Alphæus? No. Then what? Lost the point again! Again, page 148, the author states: "We now present historical proof that James, called the 'Lord's brother,' was cousin to Jesus in the flesh. . . . Jerome appears to have been the first to suggest the more probable explanation."

Who is this Jerome who appears to have been the first to suggest the "more probable explanation"? Why, he was a writer of the fourth century of the Christian era. He was the "first to suggest the more probable explanation,"—in fact one writer says he "invented" it. He was three hundred and fifty years removed from the scenes enacted, with Roman Catholic theory, tradition. and sentiment out of which to

"invent" the "more probable theory." No doubt this theory was suited to the demands of the times, a strong point to keep Mary "ever virgin," and the church on Peter. This theory was copied into the manuscripts of other writers, until of late years, scholars further removed from Catholic traditions and sentiment, and of deeper research, discard this "invention," as may be seen by the weight of testimony furnished in this article. The theory never was heard of until Jerome presented it, who was not in possession of the facts relating to it. It is simply a theory.

On page 149, we are told that, "We are at liberty, then to *assume* that the word *adelphos* among the Jews *may be* applied indifferently to the relation of brother, or to the relation of cousin. Hence, it *may be* so applied. (Matthew 13: 55, and Mark 6: 3.) That is, some of the persons there mentioned by name, *may be* strictly brethren, the rest *may be* merely cousins of the Lord."—Greswell's Works, vol. 2, p. 119.

Let us try this method of interpretation:

Mark 1:16: "he saw Simon, and Andrew his brother"—*adelphos*.

Mark 1:19: "he saw James . . . and John his brother."

Mark 3:17: "And James . . . and John the brother of James."

Mark 6: 3: "the brother of James, and Joses, and of Judah and Simon."

Mark 6:17: "for Herodias' sake, his brother Philip's wife."

Mark 12:19: "If a man's brother die, and leave (his) wife."

Mark 12:19: "that his brother should take his wife."

John 1:40: "One . . . was Andrew, Simon Peter's brother."

John 11:23: "Jesus saith unto her, Thy brother shall rise again."

In all of these instances and many others which might be cited, *brother* is from this original word *adelphos*. Can it properly mean cousin in a single one of these citations?

It will be observed that when this text is relieved of its assumptions and maybes (which we have italicized), it is

divested of pretty much all of its force. Again, "Some of the persons there mentioned by name, may be strictly the brethren," and as we take it, before it can interpret or reflect the view in Matthew 13:55, some of the persons should be "strictly the brethren," before "merely cousins" could be included.

But it is a paragraph further on that seems the worst. "The four brothers and their sisters were always found living and moving about with the Virgin Mary." Rather a natural place for a mother's children to be found, we think. But read on, "If they were the children of Cleopas the Virgin Mary was their aunt." Why, of course. "Her own husband would appear without doubt to have died between A. D. 8 and A. D. 26. Nor have we any reason for believing Cleopas to have been living during our Lord's ministry." [And none that he was dead.] "What difficulty is there in *supposing* that the two sisters (in law) should have lived together?" Why, none at all, of course. No difficulty in "supposing" anything. *If* they were children of Cleopas, there might be something in the supposition, but as this is the point to be proved, there is nothing in it whatever. But here again, "It is noticeable that Saint Mary is nowhere called the mother of the four brothers." Just so. But there is another thing "noticeable"—it is nowhere stated that she was not the mother of the four brothers. It is affirmed, however, that she "brought forth her firstborn son." This implies a second born son, and Paul affirms that James was the Lord's brother; and in Mark it is said of Jesus, "Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary, brother of James, and Joses, and of Jude, and Simeon? And are not his sisters here with us?" (Mark 6:3, and Matthew 13:55.) It is, indeed, quite "noticeable" that these children were the family of Joseph and Mary, and not cousins, as claimed.

On page 150, "the Hieronymian hypothesis" is presented, said to have been advocated by this same Jerome, already noticed, in A. D. 382, which assumes that the children referred to above were nephews and nieces of Saint Mary. This "hypothesis" was likely put in vogue to make people stare

and wonder, so they would take down the theory, genealogical map and all, as a learned conclusion. But without facts sustaining it, it remains an assumption and is entitled to no credence whatever.

On the last line of this same page, we are relieved with a new line of thought. That is, it is claimed, "First, Christ did not come from the lineage of Joseph, but through the lineage of Mary." However, Matthew and Luke both count it through Joseph (Matthew 1, Luke 3.) Besides, if the lineage of Jesus could be counted through his mother, that of the second son could also, and in either case they were brothers and heirs to the priesthood, and if only cousins of Jesus would be first entitled to considerations in priesthood lines.

On page 157, we have: "Second, the order is from father to son; and James is not the son of Jesus but of Joseph; therefore James' only right by lineage would be through his father, Joseph, and not through Christ. Hence, no right to the presidency by the above order of lineage, as it was not to be handed down from brother to brother, but from father to son. Except in case of transgression or disqualification."

It is true enough that lineage is counted from father to son, as a rule. But there are exceptions. Two are admitted, and this is not all. Another is where there is no heir to occupy under the rule. Then another rule obtains, it goes to the nearest of kin, all other things being equal. This is shown in the Nephite history. The lineage as counted may be traced by the transfer of the sacred things. They went from Nephi to his brother Jacob. From Enos to Jarom (Jarom 1:1), from Jarom to Omni (Omni 1:1), in regular succession. From Amaron to his *brother* Chemish (Omni 1:3, 4); from Chemish to Abinadom (paragraph 5), Abinadom to Amaleki (paragraph 6). Amaleki, having no children, delivered the plates to King Benjamin. They went on down to Alma, then to his son Helaman (Alma 17:5-14); from Helaman to Helaman's *brother*, Shiblon (Alma 30:1); finally to Amos, then to his *brother* Ammaron (Nephi 1:11), etc. It will be observed that the descent of the sacred records indicating the lineage or genealogical line, was from father to son, and

brother to brother; and when there was no brother, to others, which shows the theory of the writer of the Appendix wrong on this point, also.

Again the writer goes on: "We will now proceed to offer further proof to show that Peter occupied the position of 'chief apostle' and president. 1. Because he was the *first* called to the apostleship by our Savior (Matthew 10:1), and according to all rules of choosing or appointing them the first named is president, *where not otherwise designated.*"

Allowing this as a rule in business, for which the Bible makes no provision, in case of the appointment of a committee, what would the first member selected be president of? Of the committee, of course. A committee appointed by Congress, then, would not make the chairman of that committee, according to this rule, president of the United States. So accepting that Peter was chairman of the council of apostles, there is a long distance between that position and his being made president of the church.

But we read on: "2. It is evident that he continued in this chief office and leadership from beginning to end, and was so recognized by Christ both before and after his ascension."

Some very bad logic here. Because a man is appointed the head of a committee or quorum he is declared to be the head of the church, and what is equally as bad, he is continued in the leadership "both before and after his ascension." According to this Peter was president of the church both before and after the crucifixion and ascension. But what was Christ doing all of this time, that Peter was presiding over the church previous to the ascension? All of this because he was selected first among the apostles, as head of a "committee." But this is not all; he is continued "in this chief office and leadership from beginning to end." Why, yes. From the beginning to end of what? The beginning and end of the church, or what? Or is it the beginning and ending of Peter's call to the apostleship to his death? All there is of fact in any of this is that Peter may have been the recognized leader of the apostolic quorum both before and after Christ's ascension, but could not have been the president of the church in

either case, more especially if he continued in the position "from beginning to end." Again, if Peter was made president because of being selected first, then Andrew should have been given the second place, on similar grounds of being selected second; but no, James is admitted to have been second. What becomes of this supposed to be evidence, then, adduced to prove that Peter was made president of the church because he was first called to the apostleship?

"3. In the transfiguration, Peter is the first named and is spokesman for the rest." This has been answered in another place. It will be difficult to show, however, that Peter spoke for anybody but himself on this occasion.

"4. He was chief speaker when the matter of choosing an apostle instead of Judas was under consideration.

"5. Peter was chief speaker on the day of Pentecost, when the important question was asked by the multitude, etc., and the question was directed first to him; second, 'and to the rest of the apostles.'" All there is in any of this is, that the reading shows the apostles to have been in charge as a body. "Peter stood up with the eleven." There is nothing indicating a president or presidency about it. Peter is shown to be the most active member or leader of the apostolic body, that is all. He stood with the eleven and was therefore one of them in order to make the twelve.

"6. Peter was first of the twelve to whom Christ appeared after the resurrection." If there is any point in this, then Mary Magdalene should have been the president, for Jesus "first" appeared to her. But our author should have cited more passages in Peter's favor. He could have said, Peter was the *first* and only one that cursed and swore and denied his Lord, therefore he was to be the president of the church. He was the first to try walking on the water by faith, but sank, therefore he was to be the president.

"7. Peter was chief in pronouncing the judgment upon Ananias and Sapphira." This only shows Peter in his accustomed place, speaking for the apostolic body. The goods were to be "laid at the apostles' feet," not at Peter's feet.

only, not the feet of the presidency. So there is no president of the church indicated here either.

"8. Peter denounced the sorcerer Simon." (Acts 8.) We reply that Paul "denounced" and rebuked Elymas the sorcerer (Acts 13), so that if rebuking a sorcerer was evidence that Peter was to be the president of the church, the same class of evidence will make Paul the president. Hence the writer of the Appendix gets more presidents on hand than he can dispose of. It only shows that there is nothing in his assumed positions and method of reasoning.

Again, page 151: "9. Peter received knowledge of the Father, and Christ here commits the keys of the kingdom to him. (Matthew 16:16.) But the objector says that the keys, herein referred to, applied only to Peter's presidency over the quorum of the twelve."

Who this "objector" is, we are not informed. The writer of the Presidency and Priesthood, however, holds that all of the twelve hold "keys," and also other ministers, including those of the Aaronic priesthood, but the ones in chief, as in Peter's case, especially so; as is clearly presented in Doctrine and Covenants 105. Anyway, Thomas B. Marsh is especially mentioned as the one to hold the "keys."

But our author goes on, "We frankly confess that we never before knew that the terms 'quorum' and 'kingdom' were synonymous." But who has said they were "synonymous"? The writer of Presidency and Priesthood made no such statement. The Lord says to Thomas B. Marsh, "Thou art the man whom I have chosen to hold the keys of my kingdom." He then qualifies by saying ("as pertaining to the twelve"): but were they not "keys of the kingdom" all the same? Did it indicate that they were not "keys of the kingdom," because it is explained what "keys of the kingdom" they were and who was to hold them? It really looks as though our author, finding himself in a strait, has descended to a little sophistry in order to help his theory out. Taking the man of straw set up in this ninth citation a weak conclusion might be reached, but as it reflects nothing affirmed by us, or any

other that we know of, it is meaningless, as it only reflects its own absurdity.

The position held by the writer of Presidency and Priesthood on the text in Matthew 16 is that the question propounded by Jesus as to who he was, was addressed to the twelve. Peter answered for himself and his associates, and when Jesus said in answer, calling Peter by name, "And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shalt be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven," the other members of the twelve were included in the authority to be received, as seen in John 20: 23, when Jesus breathed on the twelve, he said, and to all of them, "Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." In harmony with this, Doctor William Smith says:

"The early church regarded Saint Peter generally . . . as the representative of the apostolic body; a very distinct theory from that which makes him their head, or governor in Christ's stead. Peter held no distinct office, and certainly never claimed any distinct powers which did not belong equally to all his fellow apostles."—Bible Dictionary, p. 427.

This view is the Bible view, and the one expressed in Doctrine and Covenants 105:12: "For unto you (the twelve) and those (the first presidency) who are appointed with you . . . is the power of this priesthood given, . . . the keys of the dispensation which ye have received come down from the fathers, and last of all being sent down from heaven unto you."

The power of this priesthood was given to these two quorums: "The keys of the dispensation which ye have received have come down from the fathers, and last of all being sent down from heaven unto you." "And again I say unto you [Thomas B. Marsh] that whosoever ye shall send in my name, by the voice of your brethren, the twelve."—Paragraph 8. This shows that the twelve acted together, held the authority and the keys along with the presidency, and



they were "keys of the kingdom." So much for that ninth criticism.

Again it is urged: "10. Christ, the third time having appeared to his disciples after his ascension, still recognizes Peter as chief apostle and president unto whom he had previously given the keys of the kingdom and not quorum." When did Jesus give Peter the "keys of the kingdom and not quorum"? He promised to give them the keys of the kingdom, but when did Peter receive them? Oh, I see; it was upon the Mount, for which there is not an item of proof. Does the author of the Appendix still hold that the keys given to the twelve are not keys of the kingdom? But to the conversation held by the Savior with the apostles by the seaside: Jesus said to Peter, "Feed my sheep."—John 21: 15, 16. Though this conversation was addressed to Peter, the responsibility to look after and "feed my sheep" rested upon all of the twelve. So it is written, "Now, I say unto you,—and what I say unto you I say unto all the twelve,—Arise and gird up your loins, take up your cross, follow me, and feed my sheep."—Doctrine and Covenants 105: 6. It is far from "plain to be seen," then, that Peter's "charge was not only over the quorum of the twelve, but to the whole church, either congregated together or scattered abroad." It seems "plain to be seen" that no such thing was intended, if revelation can be depended upon.

Again: "In purview of this charge (to feed my sheep), Peter writes to the 'scattered saints,' called 'strangers' and endeavors to 'feed' them as the Savior had commanded him. (See 1 Peter 1.) Again, in his second letter he addresses 'all those who have obtained like precious faith with us,' thus obeying the injunction 'feed my sheep.'" (2 Peter 1: 1.)

There is nothing in this to indicate that Peter held any position in the church but that of an apostle. Light on this point is seen in the following statement by Paul: "Then fourteen years after, I went up to Jerusalem with Barnabas, and took Titus with me also. And I went up by revelation, and communicated unto them that gospel which I preach

among the Gentiles, but privately to them which were of reputation.”—Galatians 2:1, 2.

No doubt some were of greater repute among their fellows than others. Of the conference, Paul speaks, in verse 7, “When they saw that the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter.” Verse 9: “And when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they give to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship; that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision.” Thus Peter is made the leading apostle among the Jews and Paul among the Gentiles. Both went abroad to their fields of labor, Peter to preach among the circumcision, and Paul among the uncircumcision. In after-years, both of these apostles addressed letters to those among whom they had labored and built up churches, and so far as an ecumenical character in their address, Peter’s shows no pre-eminence over that of Paul’s. The Galatian letter was addressed by Paul to the Galatians. His first Corinthian letter, “Unto the church of God, which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours.”—1 Corinthians 1:2. Nothing that Peter wrote partook so much of the ecumenical character as this letter written by Paul. Peter’s first epistle was addressed, “To the strangers abroad throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia.” His second letter was addressed to the same people (see 2 Peter 3:1) and he writes, “That ye may be mindful of the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets, and of the commandment of us, the apostles of the Lord and Savior.”—Ibid., 3:2. Here Peter puts himself with the other apostles. Peter addressed his letters to those among whom he had labored, as is admitted by all scholars. Hence there is nothing in the claim made that Peter was a whit ahead of Paul. If there is evidence for Peter’s being president, there is more for Paul; and as indicated before, this brings to the surface too many presidents, so defeats the assumption of the writer.

The facts in regard to the saying, "Feed my sheep," etc., are these: The apostles, it appears, had become discouraged, and Peter said, "I go a-fishing. They say unto him, We also go with thee." This was their old employment, and Peter was their former captain and leader in the business, before they started to follow the Nazarene. At least Peter and Andrew were in company with James and John and their father Zebedee, and they had hired servants as helpers. Peter was the leader. This will account for the fact that the other apostles looked to Peter so readily as a leader. He was a man of affairs, prominent and relied upon in a business sense before Jesus appeared among them. On the occasion here referred to Jesus perceived that they had a longing and desire to return to their former vocations, and thereby seek a livelihood, rather than go to the harder task, that of the ministry; so Jesus put the question, and to the leader, "Lovest thou me more than these?" These what? Why, these fishes and nets that were the means of their living and wealth. Jesus wished to impress upon their minds, that if they loved him, they would have to make the sacrifice and give up the fishing business and attend to the ministry,—*"Feed my sheep."* He knew they loved him, and he used this strongest tie and motive force to win them from their nets, and encourage them not to labor for the things that perish, but to carry out the commission to preach the gospel and catch men. Peter was the most culpable of any for this seeming desertion, as he was the leader in and out of the church. Only a few days had passed since he was cursing and swearing and denying the Lord. Hence Jesus plied him thoroughly, and what he said to Peter was meant for the rest as well, as expressed in Doctrine and Covenants 105:6: "What I say unto you I say unto all the twelve,—Arise and gird up your loins, take up your cross, follow me, and *feed my sheep.*" So the claim to Peter's primacy fails here also.

But we will take up and consider the point presented by the writer of the Appendix to Exegesis on Acts 15, in regard to the conference held at Jerusalem by the apostles and elders. There had been a growing feeling and conten-

tion between the Gentiles at Antioch, whose rights under the gospel were defended by Paul and Barnabas, and the Jewish converts in regard to keeping the law of Moses. The Jewish converts insisted that certain Jewish customs that were mentioned in the law should be observed by the Gentiles. The contention went on until it came to be so serious that it was necessary to carry it before the church authorities at Jerusalem. Paul was strongly in sympathy with the Gentile claims, and defended them, being the apostle to the Gentiles. Peter, on the other hand, was the apostle and leader among the circumcision, sometimes standing firm for the rights of the Gentiles, at other times vacillating and catering to the demands of the Jews. So it was necessary for Paul, in defending the rights of the Gentiles, to oppose Peter. He says, "But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed."—Galatians 2:11. The dissension began at Antioch, by the Jews insisting, "Except ye be circumcised, after the manner of Moses, ye can not be saved." Paul and Barnabas took the matter up to Jerusalem, where the contention was going on also. "And the apostles and elders came together for to consider of this matter."—Acts 15:6. The assembly was organized and had a chairman. The writer of the Appendix assumes that Peter was the president of that council. But in this he stands alone. No other writer whom we have read after so holds, whether he follows the theory of Jerome or not. In the council Paul and Barnabas were the chiefs on one side, and Peter on the other. These great, experienced leaders sat in silence while the conflict went on among the more contentious ones; the hotheads were to the front. So, "after there had been much disputing, Peter arose" (not from the chair, but down on the floor) and simply reiterated his experience he had years before, down at Joppa and the house of Cornelius, and concluded by objecting to the view being held by some, to put a yoke upon the necks of the disciples. "Then all the multitude kept silence and gave audience to Barnabas and Paul." They made their speeches. The chief ministers to Jew and Gentile had now been heard, together with those who had

stirred up the dissension. Then what? "And after they had held their peace, James answered saying, Men and brethren, hearken unto me."—Verse 13. "My sentence is that we trouble not them, which from among the Gentiles are turned to God."—Verse 19. This decision closed the matter. As is well expressed in the Diaglott, "Therefore I judge." Correct enough,—he had to judge in order to cast "sentence." But in his ambition to do something for Peter, the writer of the Appendix makes Peter the president and has him decide the matter, and then James decides it, and finally the Holy Ghost decides it. But what is worse, he has it, "Peter was the first to rise and render his decision as presiding officer." Still the discussion goes on just the same. Nothing is said about Peter deciding anything, or presiding, yet it is clear to this writer that he did. However, the discussion went on until the chief leaders had spoken, and then James said, "My sentence is," etc., after which there was no more discussion, but a general agreement or assent to the decision of James, and letters of instruction and congratulations ordered sent abroad. So our critic has lost his point on this.

We are told that this "was a special conference of the apostles and elders at Jerusalem, and not of the church in general." But the Book says, "Then pleased it the apostles and elders, with the whole church, to send chosen men," etc.

Page 153, Appendix, states: "We wish to call attention to another important point that supports the position that Peter was the president of the church. The fact that God who sent his angel to Cornelius (Acts 10) and directed him to send for Peter to present unto them the 'words of life and salvation,' and also the vision which God gave Peter, proves emphatically that God recognized Peter as the head of the church on earth."

But there is nothing required here but what is provided for in Peter's calling as an apostle. It was in the line with the sending of Ananias to seek out the unconverted and blind Saul of Tarsus; Philip joining himself to the chariot (Acts 8); and Paul being beckoned to go into Macedonia. This work belonged to the ministry abroad and not to a localized

president. At this time, however, as in the case of filling the place of Judas, the day of Pentecost, the rebuking of Ananias and Sapphira, the selecting of the seven, etc., there may have been no permanent president selected at Jerusalem.

We are not told just when James was made president; neither are we told when and how elders and bishops were introduced. We find them in existence, and in due time James was made the president of the church.

“With the apostles, James, the brother of the Lord, succeeds to the charge of the church,—that James who has been called ‘Just’ from the time of the Lord to our day, for there were many of the name of James, etc.”—Hegesippus.

Again: “For the church of Jerusalem, James, the Lord’s brother, was the first bishop thereof, as all ancient writers agree, though when and by whom he was ordained they are not so unanimous; for some say by the apostles, after the Lord’s crucifixion; others, by Christ himself; and others again, both by Christ and the apostles.”—Bingham.

But there is no history that places Peter as president either by Christ or the apostles or anybody else.

Again, the position assumed by the writer of the Appendix is absurd, in the light of the commission and authority given to the apostles, to require that the president of the church should perform all the work in person outlined by the writer. There is neither law nor precedent for it. The Lord works through whom he will. The apostles were his chief ministers abroad, and he directed them in the work to be done in the ministry abroad. He said, “Lo I am with you always.” Peter, with the other apostles selected at Jerusalem, lived and died apostles (those of them who did die) and are apostles yet in heaven, under the direction of Jesus Christ the great head of the church, and can be sent by him to minister to men on earth; hence Peter, James, and John were sent by their Master to Joseph Smith, Jr., the Seer, and Oliver Cowdery to direct in the bestowing of the priesthood upon them and their ordination. It was not required to send a former president of the church on earth, whoever he may have been, to do this work, neither to come himself.

He trusted the three strong ones, those best known, of the old guard, Peter, James, and John, and sent them. So everything is orderly and right, if only the right view is had. So the criticisms and evidences adduced by the writer of the Appendix to the Exegesis of the Priesthood fails to maintain his "contention," and much of it is not strong, to say the least, and is only noticed because of the importance of the subject in hand, and for the benefit of the inexperienced who are likely to read it.

Further evidence on the disputed points raised, is continued as follows, to which the reader's attention is called:

"James, Epistle of, one of the books of the New Testament canon, which has been ascribed to James the son of Zebedee, to a pseudo James who assumed the name to get authority, to James the son of Alphæus, and to James the brother of the Lord. . . . The entire recent literature on the epistle is reviewed in the *Studin und Kritiken*, January, 1874, by Professor Berschlag, who believes that it was written by James, the brother of the Lord, whom he distinguishes from both the apostles of that name."—The American Encyclopedia, vol. 9, p. 519.

"James the son of Alphæus. He also was one of the apostles, and is mentioned in all the four lists (Matthew 10: 3; Mark 3: 18; Luke 6: 15; Acts 1: 13) by this name, but in no other place. It is, however, thought by some that he is the same with

"James the Lord's brother. In Matthew 13: 55, and Mark 6: 3, the brethren of the Lord are named James, Joses, Judas, and Simon. It is also to be remarked that they are in both places spoken of as the children of the carpenter, that is, of Joseph the husband of the Virgin Mary. But it has been urged that they were called sons of Joseph and Mary because the children of two families,—of Mary the Virgin and Mary the wife of Clopas, her half sister,—were brought up together. Those who in this way make James, the Lord's brother, to be a son of Alphæus require to establish (a) that Clopas is the same name as Alphæus; (b) that Mary the wife of Clopas (John 19: 25) was the sister of the Virgin Mary,

and (c) that this Mary, wife of Clopas, is the same who is called (Matthew 31:56; Mark 15:40) Mary the mother of James and Joses, and (Mark 16:1; Luke 24:10) simply the mother of James, in which four passages the same person is evidently intended.

“But the identity of the names Alphæus and Clopas is by no means certain. Those who maintain it take Clopas as the Aramaic *Chalpai*, and Alphæus to be a Græcized form thereof. But when we turn to what might be supposed the best source of evidence on this point, viz., the Peshito version of the New Testament, instead of finding the two names treated as the same word, we find in all cases *Chalpai* where the Greek has Alphæus, and where Clopas or Cleopas occurs, it is simply transliterated *Kleeopha*. The same is the case with the Jerusalem Syriac. The identity of these names is, thus, far from being established. Then in John 19:25, the versions and best authorities are in favor of making four persons of those there mentioned: ‘his mother, and his mother’s sister, and Mary the wife of Clopas, and Mary Magdalene.’ This is the Peshito rendering, and, even if the conjunction were not there, it is not uncommon in scriptural enumeration to find names given in pairs without any conjunction, while to make Mary the wife of Clopas the Virgin’s sister would be to assume two Marys in the same family of sisters, which is not very probable. Whether Mary wife of Clopas was the mother of a ‘James’ (called in one place ‘the little’) and of Joses can neither be asserted nor denied from the evidence in the Gospels; but, when the other two assumptions have so little foundation to rest on, it seems impossible to consider the son of Alphæus the same person with the ‘brother of the Lord.’

“Further, James the Lord’s brother was bishop of Jerusalem (compare Galatians 1:19 with Galatians 2:9-12), and was president of the church in its earliest days. (Acts 12:17; 20:13; 21:18.) Such a position required him to be a resident in Jerusalem, while had he been an apostle (as the son of Alphæus was) we should have expected him to take his share of the missionary labor of publishing the gospel in



distant lands. But this bishop of Jerusalem was the author of the epistle of Saint James. He simply styles himself in the introduction thereto 'a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ.' He who could thus write with the certainty of being identified must have been the most famous person of his name in the church, must have been what Saint Paul in a passage (Galatians 2: 9), where he places James before both Peter and John, calls him 'a pillar' of the Christian society. And again Jude, when commencing his epistle, calls himself the brother of James, with no other mark of distinction. Here too the same James must be intended, and when we read Saint Jude's epistle (17, 18) we find him distinguishing himself from the apostles, and as it were disclaiming the apostolic dignity. This is as it would be if James and Jude were both brethren of the Lord and were not apostles, but we should certainly expect one or other would have left some indication in their letters had they been of the number of the twelve, and most surely neither of them would have been likely to give us reason for believing that he was not an apostle.

"The two passages (1 Corinthians 15: 7; Galatians 1: 19) from which it might be argued that James the brother of the Lord was an apostle can not be relied on, for we find the same title given to Barnabas, and it is certain that the name 'apostle' began to be more widely applied after the ascension than it is in the Gospels.

"Once more, the brethren of the Lord are expressly said (John 7: 5) not to have believed on Jesus at a period much later in his ministry than the appointment of the twelve; while in mention of them in Acts 1: 14 there is given first a list of the eleven, who are said all to have continued in prayer with the women and Mary the mother of Jesus and with his brethren. Such a studied severance of the brethren of the Lord from the number of the apostles is very significant, while the position which they hold in the list may well be due to the fact that it was only at a late period that they had become disciples of Jesus. The change in their opinions has been thought by many to be sufficiently

accounted for by the statement of Saint Paul (1 Corinthians 15: 7) that after his resurrection Jesus 'was seen of James.' Such a demonstration of the truth of what others had long believed and Jesus himself had taught could not fail to work conviction on a mind which, if we may accept the tradition of the 'Gospel according to the Hebrews' (which also testifies to this appearance of Christ to James), was somewhat inclined to believe, even before the crucifixion.

"It seems right, therefore, to conclude that James the son of Alphæus, one of the apostles, was a different person from James the Lord's brother and bishop of Jerusalem. Of the history of the former we are told nothing except that he was an apostle. The latter is spoken of by Saint Peter (Acts 12: 17) as if he were at that time the recognized head of the Christian community in Jerusalem. Again (Acts 15: 13), after the debate at Jerusalem about the circumcision of the Gentiles, it is he who sums up the arguments and declares the sentence of the council, as if he were the chief person among them. In Acts 21: 18, on Saint Paul's last visit to Jerusalem, he holds the same position, and receives the visit of Saint Paul in the presence of all the presbytery. In Galatians 1: 19; 2: 9, he is placed foremost among 'the pillars' of the church at Jerusalem."—*Encyclopedia Britannica*, vol. 13, pp. 532, 533.

The interested critic will peruse with satisfaction the learned disquisition of Reverend T. K. Cheyne, M. A., D. D., Oriel Professor of Holy Scripture, Oxford, in this connection as being among the best thoughts upon the subject from the other side of the water, and which is herewith submitted:

"James (Jacobus), the name of three persons preëminently mentioned in the New Testament—James the son of Zebedee, James the son of Alphæus, and James the brother of Jesus. The first two of these are included in the lists of the apostles given in the Synoptic gospels and Acts (Matthew 10: 2 F, Mark 3: 17 F, Luke 6: 14 F, Acts 1: 13). The former of this pair was a brother of John; their father a Galilean fisherman, probably a resident of Capernaum.

"Of James the son of Alphæus, called in Mark 15: 40

James the less (minor, younger) little is recorded in the New Testament. According to the same passage, his mother was a certain Mary who is there mentioned as a witness of the crucifixion. . . . The question whether James the son of Alphæus was identical with James the brother of Jesus must be discussed before the consideration of the latter. Doubtless in early times, and perhaps latterly, a prepossession in favor of the perpetual virginity of Mary the mother of Jesus has had an influence in determining some scholars to maintain the affirmative of this question. It is argued that from Matthew 27: 56, Mark 15: 40, and John 19: 25 the inference may be drawn that Mary the mother of Jesus had a sister Mary who was the wife of Cleopas, and that she was the mother of two sons, James the little and Joses. Moreover, since James, Joses (or Joseph), Judas, and Simon are mentioned in Matthew 13: 55 and Mark 6: 3 as brothers of Jesus, and since in Luke 6: 16 and Acts 1: 13 a James and a Jude are included among the apostles, it has been argued that these latter were identical with the James and Judas mentioned among the brothers of Jesus, yet they were not his brothers, but cousins. In support of this hypothesis it is maintained that James called the brother of Jesus, mentioned explicitly by Paul in Galatians 1: 19 as such, and frequently elsewhere as simply 'James,' and always indicated as holding a prominent place in the church at Jerusalem, was no other but James the son of Alphæus, who is identified by the hypothesis with Clopas of John 19: 25. Thus he would be shown to have been a cousin of Jesus, being a son of a sister of Mary, Jesus' mother, and one of the original apostles.

"This argumentation is, however, beset with insuperable difficulties. If the apostle Lebbeus (Matthew 10: 3; but R. V. and W. H. Thaddeus) who is called Thaddeus in Mark 3: 18, and who by the hypothesis was identical with 'Judas of James' of Luke and Acts was by the first evangelists known to have been a brother of James the son of Alphæus, it is improbable that this writer would not have indicated the fact after the analogy of Simon and Andrew his brother,

and James and John his brother. It is no less improbable that if Judas and Simon were sons of Alphæus and the Mary in question, they would not have been mentioned along with Joses in Matthew 27: 56 and Mark 15: 40.

"It is also evident from the attitude of Jesus' brothers toward him, according to Mark 3: 21, 31, that they could not have belonged to the friendly apostolic group. For they are here represented as 'standing without,' and were probably of the 'his friends' who went out to lay hold on him, because he was, they thought, beside himself. (Compare John 7: 5.) In this connection the fact is important that wherever they are mentioned in the New Testament they are distinguished from the apostles (Matthew 12: 46, Luke 8: 19, John 7: 3, Acts 1: 14, 1 Corinthians 9: 5; 'the other apostles' [besides Paul] and the brother of the Lord). Besides there is nowhere an intimation that any one of the apostles was either a brother or cousin of Jesus. The attempt to show from John 19: 25 that Mary, the so-called wife of Clopas (identified by the hypothesis with Alphæus), was the sister of the mother of Jesus and that hence James the son of Alphæus was his cousin, is hazardous. For it is doubtful whether Clopas and Alphæus are Aramæic and Greek forms of the same name, since the Syriac version uniformly transliterates them differently (Cleopha and Halpai). . . . The opinion that four women instead of three are mentioned here has the support of the Syriac version and many of the highest authorities (see Meyer on the passage, and Mesler in St. Kr. 40, p. 650). Besides, the position is quite tenable that according to the prevailing *usus loquendi*, 'Mary of Clopas' means Mary the daughter of Clopas, in which case Clopas would be known only as the father of the Mary mentioned in John 19: 25; see Clopas. Thus in any case the improbable supposition that in the same family there were two sisters of the same name is obviated.

"Still, even if it could be shown that James the son of Alphæus was a cousin of Jesus, it would not follow that another James was not his brother, since better reasons than those given by Lange and Meyrick are required to justify

the abandonment of the natural meaning of *adelphos*. Nor is it necessary to resort to the supposition of stepbrothers; for according to the obvious sense of 'firstborn' (*protokos*, Luke 2: 7; Matthew 1: 25 Sin. Syr.) Mary was the mother of other sons than Jesus.

"James the brother of Jesus, surnamed the Just, although sharing with the brothers, of whom he was probably the oldest, in their opposition to Jesus during his public ministry, appears to have been converted to his cause soon after the resurrection. According to Galatians 1: 18, 2: 9, Paul finds James holding a prominent place in the Christian community in Jerusalem along with Peter and John, and with these three, 'reputed pillars of the church' he came to an arrangement respecting his mission to the Gentiles. So great was the influence or authority of James that Peter was controlled by him at Antioch in the matter of eating with the Gentiles. For when 'certain' from James came, he drew back and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision (Galatians 2: 12). From this fact and from Paul's statement that, yielding from the emissaries, the rest of the Jews dissembled, 'and even Barnabas was carried away with their dissimulation,' the inference is obvious *that this brother of Jesus was the acknowledged head of the Jewish Christian party in the church of Jerusalem, and a zealot for the strict observance of the Jewish law.*"—Encyclopedia Biblica, edited by the Reverend T. K. Cheyne, M. A., D. D., Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture at Oxford and formerly Fellow of Balliol College, Canon of Rochester, and J. Southerland Black, M. A., LL. D., formerly assistant editor of the Encyclopedia Britannica, volume 2, pages 2317, 2320.

"James the Lord's brother; author of the 'Epistle of James.' He is described as holding office in the church at Jerusalem, and appears to have been president of the council that met there in A. D. 50 or 51."—The Century Encyclopedia, p. 539.

The article of the celebrated scholar and historian, Doctor Philip Schaff, is also submitted as furnishing the best attain-

able evidences from the standpoint of a faithful historian, as follows:

*"JAMES, the name of three important characters of the New Testament.*

*"I. James, the son of Zebedee.*—His mother, Salome, was a follower of Jesus (Matthew 27:56; Mark 15:41). He was a brother of John, and older than he, as is very probable from the fact that his name is almost always mentioned before John's (Matthew 10:2; Mark 3:17, etc.) It is likely, though not certain, that he became a follower of Christ immediately after the baptism in the Jordan (John 1:32; sqq). He and his brother were surnamed Boanerges, i. e., 'son of thunder,' by Christ (Mark 3:17). The reason for giving this designation is not recorded. He certainly did not intend an allusion to their eloquence, as the Fathers supposed. The more probable view is, that the surname had reference to their passionate and vehement nature, both in thought and emotion, which sometimes showed itself in ambitious aspirations (Mark 10:35; sqq) for a place of honor in the Messianic Kingdom, but also in an ardent attachment to the person of Christ.

James belonged, with John and Peter, to the narrower circle of Christ's more intimate disciples; was admitted into the chamber of Jairus' daughter (Mark 5:37), to the vision of the transfiguration (Mark 9:2), and to the scene of the agony in Gethsemane (Matthew 26). Nothing further is recorded of him than his death by the sword, under Herod Agrippa I (Acts 12:2). He was the first of the apostles to suffer martyrdom; and thus, in a more pronounced measure than in the case of John, the prediction of Christ was fulfilled in his experience, that the brothers should indeed drink of his cup, and be baptized with his baptism (Mark 10:39); and at least in point of time, he received the second place of honor in the kingdom of heaven. Ecclesiastical tradition says that the accuser of James confessed Christ, and, after receiving the apostle's pardon, himself suffered martyrdom (Clement Alexander in Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History 2, 9). The Church of Spain boasts that he shared

in its foundation, but its fables are in conflict with the statements of the New Testament.

"II. *James, the son of Alphæus*.—One of the twelve disciples of Jesus. He is so designated in four places,—Matthew 10: 3; Mark 3: 18; Luke 6: 15; Acts 1: 13. No other passage can with certainty be regarded as referring to him or his family, and nothing further is known definitely of his life. The alleged blood relationship of his family with the house of Jesus lacks all evidence. This hypothesis identifies his father Alphæus with Clopas, and makes 'Mary the wife of Clopas' (John 19: 25) a sister of Mary the mother of Jesus, or Clopas a brother of Joseph (Hegesippus). These suggestions are pure assumptions; for it is not at all certain that *Maria e tou Klopa* means the wife of Clopas. It may mean the mother, or daughter, of Clopas. Nor has the identification of the name Alphæus with Clopas anything in its favor. A further objection is that sisters would not be apt to have the same name, Mary. It is possible that he is the James whose mother is called Mary (Matthew 27: 56; Mark 16: 1); and who is styled 'James the Less,' and the brother of Joses (Mark 15: 40). The title 'the Less' contained an allusion to his stature, and was not given to distinguish him from James the son of Zebedee (Meyer). But it is possible that another James is here mentioned, as we would rather expect the expression, 'James the son of Alphæus.' Of his further experiences we know nothing, except that according to tradition, he labored in Egypt, where he suffered martyrdom by crucifixion, in the city of Ostrakine (Niceph. 2: 40).

"III. *James the Just, the brother of the Lord*, the head of the church at Jerusalem, is distinguished from the two apostles of the same name in Matthew 13: 55; Mark 6: 3; Acts 12: 17; 15: 13; 21: 18; 1 Corinthians 15: 7; Galatians 1: 19; 2: 9, 12; James 1: 1; Jude 1; and is mentioned by Josephus (Antiquities 20, 9, 1), Hegesippus (Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, 2, 33) and the church fathers.

"In the early church the existence of our James as a distinct person was denied by some: he being identified with

one of the two apostles of that name; and more generally with James the son of Alphæus. The fraternal relation reported to have existed between James and Jesus was explained as a relation between cousins. But Tertullian is a witness to the fact that the distinction between James and the apostles was still held in his day. He speaks of the consummation of Mary's marriage with Joseph after the birth of Jesus, and of the brothers of Jesus (*De carne Christi* 7, *adv. Marc.* 19), to prove the reality of the incarnation over against Gnostic objections. At a somewhat later date the Apostolic Constitutions (2.55, 6.12, 13) declare for the same view, when they mentioned as the representatives of Catholic doctrine the twelve apostles, Paul and James the brother of the Lord, who is also placed among the seventy disciples. That a fraternal relation is here meant is vouched for by another passage (7:46): 'I James, a brother of the Lord according to the flesh.' The testimony of Eusebius is also very important. He clearly distinguishes James, the brother of the Lord, from the twelve apostles, places him among the seventy disciples, and counts fourteen apostles in all, Paul being the thirteenth, and James the fourteenth (Com. Jes. 17:5; Ecclesiastical History 1, 12; 2, 1; 7, 19); and the passage (Ecclesiastical History, 2, 1) in which he speaks of him as the 'so-called' brother of the Lord does not refer to a more distant relationship, for he prepares the way for his expression by stating that Jesus was born before the consummation of the marriage between Mary and Joseph. Gradually the presumption of the perpetual virginity of Mary gained currency, and the fraternal relation of James was resolved into the relation of a step-brother. It is a matter of doubt whether this was done by Hegesippus, and in the pseudo-Clementine writings; but it is certain that there is not a trace in either of an identification of the brother of the Lord with an apostle. Hegesippus clearly makes this distinction (Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, 2, 23). In the Protevangelium Jacobi, which originated in Essenic Christian circles, Joseph is represented as having been an aged man, surrounded with grown-up sons, before



his espousal with Mary. It was only with hesitation that some learned Fathers, under the influence of a growing devotion to Mary, adopted this fable. The first trace of it occurs in Clement of Alexandria,—whom Origen followed, leaning upon Josephus and some others, (*tines* in the Greek) Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Alexandria, Ecumenius, Hilary, and others.

“From this hypothesis, which was entirely wanting in historical confirmation, it was natural to proceed farther, and resolve the fraternal relation into that of cousin, and identify the so-called brothers of our Lord with the apostles of the same name. It is quite possible that Clement of Alexandria identifies James the brother of the Lord with James the son of Alphæus; for he speaks of only two men by this name—the one thrown from a tower, the other executed with the sword (Eusebius’ Ecclesiastical History 2:1). But the first to declare himself distinctly for this identification was Jerome, who wrote a work against Helvidius, advocating the doctrine of Mary’s perpetual virginity. He speaks of the theory that James was a son of Joseph by a former marriage as an ungrounded fancy taken from the Apocrypha, and tries to prove that our James was the same as James the son of Alphæus by identifying Mary of John 19:25 (‘Mary the wife of Clopas’) the sister of Jesus’ mother, with the wife of Alphæus. He seems after to have renounced this theory; for in his commentary on Isaiah (17:6) he mentions fourteen apostles,—the twelve, James the brother of the Lord, and Paul. Augustine spoke of James as the son of Joseph by a former marriage, or as a relation of Mary. To the latter view he gave the preference. These various views have had their advocates among modern divines. The theory that James the Just was a son of Mary and Joseph, and is to be distinguished from the apostles, has been held by Herder, Stier, Credner, De Wette, Wieseler, Neander, Schaff, Lechler, Reuss, Huther, B. Weiss, Bleck, Keim [Alford Farrar], and others; Stier, Wieseler, however, referring Acts 12:17, 15:13, 21:18, Galatians 2:9-12 to James the son of Alphæus. Semler, Hug, Schneckenburger,

Hoffmann, Lange, and others identify our James with James the son of Alphæus. And Theirsch and [Lightfoot] hold that he was a son of Joseph by a former marriage. The statements of the New Testament emphatically favor the first view. The expressions in Matthew 1:25, and Luke 2:7 most naturally imply that the marriage between Joseph and Mary was consummated after Christ's birth; and the expression 'first-born son,' by the analogy of the other cases in the New Testament (Romans 8:29; Colossians 1:15, 18; Hebrews 11:28; Revelation 1:5) indicates that other children were born to Mary. The subsequent close relation in which the so-called brothers of our Lord stand to Mary (Matthew 12:47; sqq; 13:55; Mark 6:3; John 2:12; Acts 1:14) likewise strongly favors this view. The word *brother* (*adelphos*, in the Greek) is never used in the New Testament of any other than the fraternal relation; and the few cases adduced from the Old Testament are indefinite; and special terms are employed for kindred (*suggenes* in the Greek) and cousin (*enepsios* Mark 6:4; Luke 1:63, 2:44; Colossians 4:10). To these arguments must be added the fact that James the brother of the Lord and the Lord's 'brethren' are distinguished from the apostles (John 2:12; Acts 1:13; 1 Corinthians 9:5). In John 7:5 it is stated that in contrast to the disciples, the brethren of the Lord had not believed; and in Matthew 12:46 Christ institutes a comparison between his brethren by blood and by moral affinity.

"Paul's expression in Galatians 1:19—'other of the apostles saw I none save James the Lord's brother'—refers back to Peter, and not forward to James. He afterwards (Galatians 2:9) calls James a 'pillar' of the church, avoiding the expression 'apostle,' but in 1 Corinthians 15:7 he is as little distinguished from 'all the apostles' as Peter is from the twelve (1 Corinthians 15:5). The expression *Servant of the Lord* (James 1:1) does not prove anything at all against the view; for the appellation *the brother of the Lord*, which was given to him by others as a mark of distinction, would have been out of place in his own mouth.

The objection that the names of the four brothers of the Lord correspond to the names of four of the apostles ought to be of little weight when we remember that Josephus mentions no less than twenty-one different persons by the name of Simon, and sixteen by the name of Judas. James was, therefore, the full brother of Jesus, and a different person from the two apostles of that name. James was the representative of the conservative Jewish party at the council of Jerusalem (Acts 15) and stood at the head of the local church. The party of the Ebionites took him as a Nazarite, who from his childhood had drunk neither wine nor strong drink, had never been anointed with oil, never bathed, never worn any but linen garments, and whose hair had never been cut. He was surnamed the Just, and represented as having prayed constantly at the temple for the forgiveness of his people. According to Hegesippus, he suffered martyrdom in 69, by being thrown from a pinnacle of the temple by the Pharisees; but according to Josephus he was stoned to death by the Sadducees in 62 or 63.

The latter passage is of doubtful authenticity, and the former statement is to be preferred.

LIT.—*Schaff*: D. Verhältniss d. Jakobus, Bruders d. Herrn zu, J. Alphæi, Berlin, 1842; NEANDER: The planting of the Christian Church; [LIGHTFOOT: Commentary on the Galatians, Excursus (pp. 247-283). On the brethren of the Lord, 2d Ed., London, 1866; EADIE: Commentary on Galatians, Edinburgh, 1869, pp. sqq., and the Commentaries on the Acts, and Epistle of James]. SIEFERT.—*Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, vol. 2, pp. 1139-1141. Published in 1891.

To conclude. The reader will have observed:

1. That James the son of Alphæus and James the Lord's brother were two distinct persons.

2. That James was a brother of Jesus and not a cousin, as claimed. That he was a son of Mary the mother of Jesus.

3. That the son of Alphæus belonged to the apostolic quorum. James the Lord's brother did not.

4. James the Lord's brother was made president of the Jerusalem church after the ascension of the Savior.

5. No facts either in sacred or secular history point to Peter, James, and John as a presidency of the church at Jerusalem.

6. That there is no foundation for the theory invented that the brethren of the Lord were not his brothers according to the flesh, but cousins. That this invention was put in vogue hundreds of years after Christ's ascension, to support Roman Catholic views, of Mary being "ever virgin," etc.

7. That the best authorities deny the contention of our opponents.

8. That nothing authoritative is had as statements made by Joseph Smith, on the disputed questions. If he said what is claimed for him, no reason is assigned for his opinion, hence it is worth what any other unsupported opinion would be and no more.

9. In the light of the facts herein presented the contention of our opponents is not supported, and James the Lord's brother, a son of Joseph and Mary "beyond question" was after the ascension of our Lord constituted the president of the Jerusalem church and acted as such, and not Peter, James, and John, as claimed.

LAMONI, Iowa, June 8, 1903.

---

## APPENDIX H.

---

It has been assumed that the omission to restate, or reproduce, positions taken originally by the writer upon this question is proof that they are abandoned, and that therefore Jude and Silas were dropped out by the force and "magic" of the wonderful attack upon the position. This is a hard blow to our critic's seer-ship and weakens our faith in his ability to read the handwritings on the wall. He should have learned that facts keep over, while it is necessary to

parade fancy and error. This gives us an opportunity, however, to restate our positions relative to Jude and Silas, (see pages 70 and 71 of Presidency and Priesthood,) as follows:

"The best evidence obtainable, however, points to the Apostle Jude as being one that was associated with the president of the church." . . . "As to who the other assistant was, it is yet more doubtful. It is highly probable, however, that it was Silas, possibly 'Judas, surnamed Barsabas.'"

There is not the strong and well supported evidence for Jude and Silas being counselors that there is for James being the president, and it was so admitted in Presidency and Priesthood. With these names given and others suggested, the matter was left open for further research. The likelihood of Jude having been one of the counselors has better support than in the case of Silas. Jude was one of the brethren of Jesus, as we believe, hence in his epistle he identified himself before the church as being "the brother of James," and not as one of the college of apostles. It would be quite natural that two brothers of the highly favored family should be selected to act together at the head as other brethren or kindred of the same family were selected to succeed James. But it is the president-in-chief that is claiming our attention in particular in this investigation. Other positions are of minor importance and are so treated. Never mind the side issues.

It will be observed that our critic in his effort has not moved a single position taken in our previous article, or met the overwhelming force of evidence adduced. It is much easier to assume the role of a Daniel and read an imaginary handwriting on the wall, than to marshal reliable evidence in support of a theory.

The criticism is unnecessarily lame, as we conceive, wherein he bases an argument upon the proposition that there is no "clear statement of either position in the New Testament." Not clear-cut, but circumstantial evidence. It is the circumstantial evidence that is relied upon of which we have offered an abundance of proof, and the fact that James actually presided, received reports from Peter, and when they are

associated in the writings James is named first and made the most prominent by the Apostle Paul.

Right here I will "be pleased" to furnish our critic a little more circumstantial, yet positive, evidence from the New Testament for consideration, the like of which in point of clearness and relevancy he will never be able to summon anything in favor of his theory to equal or even approach.

After the crucifixion the apostles were in charge for a time and there was no presidency in the sense of a first presidency. Our opponent contends that Peter, James, and John were first presidents then, and in charge, were ordained upon the mount long before the crucifixion, etc. In the light of this assumption the following will be interesting reading: When Philip had preached the word at Samaria and believers were made to the cause, it is written, "Now when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John." Who is this sending Peter and John, two of our critic's "first presidency"? Read again, the apostles "sent" them; but our critic in *Herald*, volume 51, page 7, again says, "Nowhere are the twelve given any authority to direct the presidency." Just so. Hence Peter and John were not presidents when the apostles directed them to go to Samaria. This is true or, according to the theory advanced by the opposition, we have a reversal of things in this experience, the twelve sending the presidency. So the writer of the Exegesis is put in direct conflict with himself. Peter and John, I suppose, had forgotten all about their ordination, again, as presidents upon the mount, and that they held presiding keys, and so they depended upon the apostles to send them to Samaria. Why did not Peter and John send themselves if they were at the head, or direct in some manner? The case is clear that they had no directing authority in the sense of being a first presidency, and depended upon the other apostles to send them, so they went as the apostles directed them.

This is in harmony with the statement in Acts 2, "And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fel-

lowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." It is the "apostles' doctrine" and the "apostles" that "sent" our critic's presidency to Samaria; yet, the writer of Exegesis states that he will "be pleased to call attention to an ample supply of Scriptural evidence that Peter, James, and John constituted the presidency."

Again, "Then the twelve called the multitude of the disciples unto them, and said, It is not reason that we should leave the word of God, and serve tables. Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom ye may appoint over this business."—Acts 6: 2, 3. Our critic's first presidency had not become conscious of their high position of being ordained upon the mount and placed at the head yet. The apostles are running the presidency, according to his theory, and everything else. All of this shows there is nothing in the criticism made on the advanced theory of Peter, James, and John having received an ordination as presidents upon the mount.

But the author of Exegesis still argues that his *Millennial Star* quotation must be received and honored as authority, notwithstanding its absurdity, as shown in a previous article. There is no claim for this report that it was influenced by the Holy Spirit in being brought to mind like the things that Jesus taught were brought to the minds of the apostles, or as in the inspiration of angels conversing with Joseph Smith and others. It was simply a talk and report after an ordinary fashion; besides being printed under the auspices of the Brighamites and made to read in perfect keeping with their views of church organization and government, it is suspicious to begin with. It has been shown to be in conflict with facts, no matter who got it up, hence is not worthy of credence.

But the author of Exegesis says: "Bro. Kelley arrives at the conclusion that all historical matter contained in their church (Brighamite) publications is unreliable and can not be accepted as authentic." Bro. Kelley arrives at no such conclusion. There is a wide difference between *some* and

*all.* There would be no object in any one changing history in any particular except it was that part that would need to be changed to conform to their peculiar claims, and that is where this text from the *Millennial Star* is made to do duty. New Testament facts and history are all against its being true; but it is in harmony with the claims made by the Utah church, therefore doubtful. They acknowledge to having revised the history, under the inspection of President Young, who knew above all others how to eliminate, mold, and change things to support his pretensions. Would any man of sense suppose there would be a change affected where it was not in conflict with their pretensions?

It is not correct either that our historians have inserted unquestioned the historical matters as they appear in the *Times and Seasons* and *Millennial Star*. The Reorganization opposed that by resolution. We are sorry that the writer of *Exegesis* has been so careless, in view of his coming so "widely before the public," just now, as to make the statements he has concerning this. But as the historians themselves have published an article covering this point, it is not necessary to consume further space with it here. The reader is referred to their statements, *Herald* for January 20, 1904, page 70, from which the following extracts are taken: "In answer to inquiry as to the extent that the writers and compilers of Church History depended upon publications issued by the church in Utah for historical matter, we say that we did not, as a rule, record important events upon such authority alone. Though we sometimes quoted from such publications, it was not until the events related were verified by reference to other authority. We did not always verify all the details, but became satisfied that the leading events happened as recorded. We tried to keep in view the resolution of the General Conference of 1893 which says, 'Resolved, that in our judgment much of the church history contained in the *Millennial Star*, and also in *Times and Seasons*, is of extremely doubtful character, and can not be safely relied upon, therefore it should not be employed as authority in matters affecting the government of the church.'—Conference



Minutes, p. 72. . . . Elder Charles W. Wandell, who died in Australia, March 14, 1875, while commenting upon the history of Joseph Smith as published in the *Deseret News* in 1855, makes the following statement: 'I notice these interpolations because having been employed (myself) in the historian's office at Nauvoo by Doctor Richards, and employed, too, in 1845, in compiling this very autobiography, I know that after Joseph's death his memoir was "doctored" to suit the new order of things, and this, too, by the direct order of Brigham Young to Doctor Richards and systematically by Richards.'—Church History, vol. 4, p. 97. This is admitted by the Utah church in their preface to volume one of their church history published in 1902, pages 5 and 6."

As further evidence, the following is in point, *Times and Seasons*, volume 5, page 638. At a special meeting held August 8, 1844, over which Brigham Young presided, the question was put: "'All in favor of supporting the twelve in their calling, (every quorum, man and woman,) signify it by the uplifted hand'; and the vote was unanimous, no hand being raised in the negative."

In the *Millennial Star*, volume 25; 215, 64, an account of the same meeting is given, as follows: "Do the church want and is it their only desire to sustain the twelve as the First Presidency of the church and at the head of this kingdom in all the world, stand next to Joseph walk up in their calling and hold the keys of this kingdom, every man, every woman, every quorum is now put in order . . . manifest it by holding up the right hand. (There was a universal vote.)"

Comment is unnecessary here to show that history is made to read in harmony with the changed sentiment of the people. One time the twelve are sustained "in their calling"; at another, they are sustained as the "First Presidency." Change wrought to support the views of the Brighamite church claims; just what we have contended was done.

In referring to the inconsistency of the thought that a conference or high council was called upon the mount of transfiguration we are met in reply, "May I not ask to be

informed what high council or general conference authorized the ordaining of James the Lord's brother to the presidency?" In the light of the fact upon which all agree, that we have but a scrap of the history of those times, this is a stunner. However, as nearly as can be, with present knowledge, the desired information will be given. In order to do so one of the Exegesis' witnesses will be put upon the stand to testify—Doctor William Smith. In speaking of the manner of procedure after the ordination of the seven (see Acts 6), he says, "We incline to the hypothesis which makes the seven the originals of the deacons. From this time, therefore, or from about this time, there existed in the church (1) the apostles; (2) the deacons and evangelists; (3) the multitude of the faithful. We hear of no church officer till the year 44, seven years after the appointment of the deacons. We find that there were then in the church of Jerusalem officers named presbyters (XI 30) who were the assistants of James, the chief administrator of that church (XII 67). The circumstance of their first appointment is not recorded. No doubt they were similar to those under which the deacons were appointed. The name of *presbyter* or *elder* implies that men selected were of mature age. By the year 44, therefore, there were in the church of Jerusalem (1) the apostles holding the government, holding the whole body in their own hands; (2) presbyters invested by the apostles with authority for conducting public worship in each congregation; (3) deacons or evangelists invested with the lesser power of preaching and baptizing believers and distributing the common goods among the brethren. . . . It was in the church of Jerusalem that another order of the ministry found its exemplar. James, the brother of the Lord, remained unmolested during the persecution of Herod Agrippa in the year 44, and from this time he is the acknowledged head of the church of Jerusalem. A consideration of Acts 12:17; 15:13, 19; Galatians 2:2; 9:12; Acts 21:18, will remove all doubt on this point. Whatever his prominence was, he appears to have borne no special title, but it is impossible to read the epistles addressed to them without seeing that they held an authority superior

to that of the ordinary bishops or priests (1 Timothy 3; 5: 17, 19; Titus 1: 5, 7.)"—Bible Dictionary, under heading of Church, p. 99.

The time and place then of the appointment and ordination of James and elders and bishops are not given, but that they were selected and ordained is proven by the fact that they held offices in the church. In Latter Day Saint parlance, Timothy and Titus would have been called seventies, most likely; and James, the president of the church. It appears from this statement of Doctor Smith, that James the President (though Doctor Smith gives him no title,—others call him bishop), together with elders and bishops, were ordained sometime between the ordination of the deacons and the year 44, no history giving the specific occasion or details, but in reasonable probability the action was orderly and, to a Latter Day Saint, in harmony with the law which says, "No person is to be ordained to any office in this church, where there is a regularly organized branch of the same, without the vote of that church!" "Every president of the high priesthood or presiding elder, bishop, high counselor, and high priest is to be ordained by the direction of a high council or general conference."—Doctrine and Covenants, p. 17, pars. 16, 17.

Again the criticism is made in *Herald*, volume 51, page 7, as follows: "Now, dear reader, please notice the fact herein stated by Peter, James, and John to Joseph and Oliver, that they (Peter, James, and John) possessed the keys of the kingdom and not the keys as pertaining to the twelve," etc.

This statement, dear reader, is not correct, as you may see by reading the paragraph quoted. The statement is not made that they do not possess the keys as pertaining to the twelve. No such thought is expressed. This is more cider in the cotton. The language to Thomas B. Marsh was, "Thou art the man whom I have chosen to hold the keys of my kingdom abroad among all nations." We have left out the parenthetical statement "(as pertaining to the twelve)" on purpose that our critic may see, if he will, that the keys held by the twelve are the keys of the kingdom, and refer to the ones by which the gospel was to be preached to the

nations, the same that Jesus conferred upon the apostles together with the special favor extended to Peter, James, and John, as the following proves, and there is no first presidency hinted at even, in anything or at any time when authority was being talked of or was bestowed upon them. Section 7, Doctrine and Covenants: "I say unto thee, Peter, this was a good desire, but my beloved has desired that he might do more, or a greater work yet among men, than what he has before done; yea, he has undertaken a greater work; therefore I will make him as flaming fire and a ministering angel; he shall minister for those who shall be heirs of salvation who dwell on the earth; and I will make thee to minister for him and for thy brother James; and unto you three I will give this power and the keys of this ministry until I come." The work of Peter and John differ. Had it been a work of the presidency it would have been identical. This conversation took place at the Sea of Tiberius, the third time that Jesus showed himself to his disciples after his resurrection, on that memorable occasion that Jesus said unto Peter: "Feed my sheep." The keys of the kingdom specially designed for Peter, James, and John were yet to be given to them, not to be a presidency, but to act in "this ministry," given to those who were to be heralds of salvation or chief ministers and apostles abroad. John's special desire was to do a greater work "yet among men, than he had before done," but along the same lines. The power and keys of "this ministry" were to be given them to hold as men and angels whose duty it was to preach the gospel to all the world and minister to those who were heirs of salvation. It would appear, then, that the especial keys of the kingdom promised to those three in addition to what they already held were bestowed after Christ manifested himself to the twelve at the Sea of Tiberius. Nothing strange that they should appear in the last days with the keys of the dispensation of the fullness of times, which no one will have the courage to claim they held at that time in Palestine. This will enable our opponents to figure out more closely the time when these especial keys were bestowed. The question is not, Did the

apostles receive keys, authority, and commission? but, Were Peter, James, and John constituted a first presidency? This latter we deny and think the facts support our claims.

"The Melchisedec priesthood holds the right of presidency, and has power and authority over all the offices in the church."—Doctrine and Covenants 104:3. The church officers appointed to hold the keys of this presiding priesthood were, (1) "a patriarch," (2) "a presiding elder over all my church, to be a translator, revelator, a seer, and prophet," (3) twelve apostles, "which twelve hold the keys to open up the authority of my kingdom upon the four corners of the earth, and after that to send my word to every creature," etc.—Doctrine and Covenants 107:37-46.

Then follows the naming of the several officers of the priesthood down to that of deacon, with the specific statement: "The above offices I have given unto you, and the keys thereof, for helps and for governments, for the work of the ministry, and the perfecting of my saints, and a commandment I give unto you that you should fill all these offices and approve of those names which I have mentioned, or else disapprove of them, at my general conference, and that ye should prepare rooms for all these offices in my house when you build it unto my name." These keys are recognized as belonging to the several officers of the priesthood all the way from the office of deacon to that of the first president, and the keys are held by the ones occupying the respective offices in the priesthood; so we read in the address to the elders: "Lift up your hearts and rejoice, for unto you the kingdom, or in other words the keys of the church, have been given."—Doctrine and Covenants 42:18.

"Again I say unto you that it shall not be given to any one to go forth to preach my gospel, or to build up my church, except he be ordained by some one who hath authority, and it is known to the church that he has authority."—Ibid., par. 4.

This authority and keys are in the office to which one is assigned. So priesthood and keys are held by the several ordained officers in the church. What of that notion then

that the twelve do not hold the keys of the kingdom?

This twelve has been shown to be the second presidency in this presiding priesthood, holding the keys of the kingdom to carry the gospel to every creature. It was the keys of this ministry that were given to Peter, James, and John as shown in Doctrine and Covenants 6, and not as a located presidency. There was no second presidency in the church at the time of the giving of the revelation of Doctrine and Covenants 80. When the twelve were selected, they were authorized with the keys of the kingdom as the "second presidency" or twelve apostles; so we read, "Rebel not against my servant Joseph, for verily I say unto you I am with him and my hand shall be over him, and the keys which I have given unto him and also to youward," etc., which shows that the authorizing of the twelve was through the Seer, and this twelve were to go abroad among all nations the same as the twelve of which Peter was a member, was commissioned to go.

In reading the Book of Doctrine and Covenants it will be observed that the First President and First Presidency are not always referred to by the same terms. They are designated as "the presidency"; "the presidency of the high priesthood"; "quorum of the presidency"; "the presidency of the high council of the high priesthood"; "president of the office of the high priesthood"; "presiding elder over all my church"; "three presiding high priests"; etc.

The same is true of the twelve apostles: They are designated as a "traveling high council"; "twelve traveling council"; "the twelve traveling counselors"; "twelve apostles"; "special witnesses of the name of Christ in all the world"; "the second presidency"; "quorum of the twelve"; "quorum of the twelve, my servants"; "traveling council of the twelve"; "the twelve"; "the quorum"; "council of the twelve"; "the council"; "the traveling high council composed of the twelve"; etc.

The several officers composing these two leading quorums occupy positions in the presiding high priesthood (see section 104, paragraphs 3 and 9), hold the chief authority and keys of the same, so we read: "Therefore see to it that ye

trouble not yourselves concerning the affairs of my church in this place, saith the Lord; but purify your hearts before me, and then go ye into all the world, and preach my gospel unto every creature who has not received it; and he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not, and is not baptized, shall be damned. For unto you (the twelve) and those (the first presidency), who are appointed with you, to be your counselors and your leaders, is the power of this priesthood given, for the last days and for the last time, in the which is the dispensation of the fullness of times, which power you hold in connection with all those who have received a dispensation at any time from the beginning of the creation; for verily I say unto you, The keys of the dispensation which ye have received, have come down from the fathers; and last of all, being sent down from heaven unto you.”—Section 105: 12.

Again, speaking of the president of the twelve: “Thou art the man whom I have chosen to hold the keys of my kingdom (as pertaining to the twelve) abroad among all nations.”—Paragraph 7. “Which twelve hold the keys to open up the authority of my kingdom upon the four corners of the earth.”—Section 107, paragraph 40. Notwithstanding this plain reading we are gravely told that the twelve apostles do not hold the keys of the kingdom, and that the president of the quorum holds no more authority than others, except in quorum session. Yet this president was to hold the keys of the kingdom “abroad among all nations.” Was it to be done in quorum session? What next?

In order to emphasize the relationship of the two leading quorums, their respective callings, authority, and keys, etc., the following is added:

It will be observed that: “The power and authority of the higher, or Melchisedec priesthood, is to hold the keys of all the spiritual blessings of the church; to have the privilege of receiving the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven”; etc.—Section 104, paragraph 9. Paragraph 31: “Wherefore, it must needs be that one be appointed, of the high priesthood, . . . and he shall be called president of the high priest-

hood of the church, or, in other words, the presiding high priest over the high priesthood of the church," etc. This leading officer is to be selected from among those holding the high priesthood. "And again, the duty of the president of the office of the high priesthood is to preside over the whole church, and to be like unto Moses. Behold, here is wisdom, yea, to be a seer, a revelator, a translator, and a prophet; having all the gifts of God which he bestows upon the head of the church."—Paragraph 42. This president with his two assistants or counselors constitute "the presidency of the council of the high priesthood" (paragraph 35), or fills "the office of the high priesthood," and of course holds all the keys and gifts pertaining to that office. But who would conclude from this that these men hold all the offices, keys, and gifts of the high priesthood? By reading this same section, it will be seen that the various offices in the priesthood are mentioned in their order, concluding with paragraph 44, which says: "Wherefore, now let every man learn his duty, and to act in the office in which he is appointed, in all diligence." Among the presiding officers mentioned it is said: "The twelve are a traveling, presiding high council, to officiate in the name of the Lord."—Paragraph 12. "Being sent out, holding the keys to open the door by the proclamation of the gospel of Jesus Christ."—Paragraph 13. What are the keys held by this twelve? "The keys to open up the authority of my kingdom upon the four corners of the earth."—Section 107, paragraph 40. "Hold the keys of my kingdom (as pertaining to the twelve) abroad among the nations."—Section 105, paragraph 7. This is the second presidency of the presiding priesthood. Of the second presidency it is said: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." The first and second presidency occupied offices in the same presiding high priesthood, possessing the keys and gifts of the respective offices held. The first presidency occupying "the office of the high priesthood," are at the head—the "presiding elder," "over all my church," at a "seat"; the second, "abroad." Doctor W. Smith has very fittingly expressed the relationship of these two quorums. He says, "Here we find James on a level with Peter and



with him deciding on the admission of Saint Paul into fellowship with the church at Jerusalem; and from henceforth we always find him equal or in his own department *superior*, to the very chiefest apostles, Peter, John, and Paul. For by this time he had been appointed to preside over the infant church in its most important center.”—Bible Dictionary, p. 2371. So the “three presiding high priests, chosen by the body, appointed and ordained to that office,” (section 104, paragraph 11,) “constitute a quorum and first presidency, to receive the oracles for the church” (section 107, paragraph 39).

“The twelve traveling councilors are called to be the twelve apostles, or special witnesses of the name of Christ, in all the world”; “And they form a quorum equal in authority and power to the three presidents previously mentioned,” etc.—Section 104, paragraph 11. These two quorums hold equal authority and power in the church by reason of the positions they occupy in the presiding priesthood, hence are presidents, holding the chief authority of that priesthood at home and abroad.

The keys or authority to preach the gospel in all the world was committed unto Peter and his associate apostles; the keys of “the office of the high priesthood” was occupied by a “presiding elder over all my church”; and with his two counselors constituted a first presidency.

This first and second presidency held the keys of the kingdom in chief at home and abroad. The one at a “seat”; the other to go into all the world and preach the gospel. So the second presidency or twelve apostles do hold the keys of the kingdom, as well as the First Presidency, who occupy “the office of the high priesthood,” with its still higher gifts of office, keys and prerogatives.

The authority of the priesthood is transferable as well as the gifts of office, and may be held by persons on earth and in heaven, and at the same time, or be exercised by more than one on earth at a time. So it is said of Judas, “His bishopric let another take.”—Acts 1: 20; of David Patten: “His priesthood no man taketh from him, but verily I say

unto you, Another may be appointed unto the same calling."—Doctrine and Covenants 107: 40. Hyrum Smith was appointed to the "priesthood, and gifts of the priesthood, that once were put upon him that was my servant Oliver Cowdery"; and was also appointed to be "a prophet, and a seer, and a revelator unto my church, as well as my servant Joseph." (Ibid., 107: 29.) Of Joseph it is said: "The keys of this kingdom shall never be taken from you, while thou art in the world, neither in the world to come."—Ibid., 87: 2. The keys of this ministry (proclaiming the gospel) were given to Peter, James, and John until the coming of Christ. (Ibid., 7: 2.) The church was established, however, and men on earth held the keys of the kingdom for the work to be done on earth; and by the same authority, rights, and keys, the work relating to the redemption of man is going on in heaven. Yet we are asked to believe that the First Presidency alone holds keys of the kingdom on earth. But this view of the matter is too palpably absurd to require further notice here. It will be time enough for the opponents to extend their criticisms when they are able to point out from some authentic source that Peter ever held any office in the church except that of one of the twelve apostles. They have not yet been able to so point out, and it is safe to say they never will, for it is not to be found. When the Lord refers to Peter he speaks of him as "mine apostle of old, whose name was Peter." (Doctrine and Covenants 49: 2.) The Lord most likely knew what office Peter held in the church.

In this connection the following from the pen of the Reverend George Waddington, D. p 1, M. A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Prebendary of Ferring, in the Cathedral Church of Chichester, taken from his History of the Church from the Earliest Ages to the Reformations, should be read with interest by the truth-seeker, and none will even suspicion that he wrote with the least taint of Latter Day Saint leaning in chronicling his views on church history. He says: "The converts of Jerusalem naturally formed the earliest Christian society, and for a short time

probably the most numerous." Continuing he says: "About the year 69 A. D., James, surnamed the Just, brother of the Savior, who was the first president, or bishop of the church of Jerusalem, perished by a violent death; and when its members subsequently assembled for the purpose of electing his successor their choice fell on Simeon, who is also said to have been a kinsman of Jesus. Shortly after the death of Saint James, an insurrection of the Jews broke out, which was followed by the invasion of the Roman armies, and was not finally suppressed until the year 70, when the city was overwhelmed by Titus and utterly destroyed." Again, "during the next sixty years we read little respecting the church of Jerusalem, excepting the names of fifteen successive presidents, called 'Bishops of the Circumcision,' fourteen of these only belong to the period in question, since the destruction of the city by the emperor Adrain. . . . The church over which they presided seems to have perished with them; yet it would appear from scripture that some sort of authority was at first exercised by the mother church over the Gentile children; and that the decrees ordained by the apostles and elders which were at Jerusalem found obedience even among distant converts."—Chapter 1, pages 29, 30. Considering that this learned writer was a Congregationalist in belief renders his statements the more forceful, as he was partial to the Congregational view of church government.

There is no controversy over the fact that there was a division of duties, keys, and callings in regard to the first and second presidency. In the presiding priesthood, the authority is the same. There is a distinguishing difference in the offices held and the duties and gifts belonging to the ones occupying. Our critic's effort on this was all wasted.

On page 8, volume 51, we are told: "We are asked to believe that Peter answered for the rest of the apostles in Matthew 16:17." Replying to this we cite the words of our critic's witness again. Doctor Smith referring to the selection and naming of the apostles says: "From this time there can be no doubt that Peter held the first place among the apostles, to whatever cause his precedence is to be

attributed. He is named first in every list of the apostles, he is generally addressed by our Lord as their representative, and on the most solemn occasions he speaks in their name."

Peter assumed the same prominence from the time of his choosing that he did after, *i. e.*, was in the lead of the twelve—spoke for them. "Thus when the first great secession took place in consequence of the offense given by our Lord's mystic discourse at Capernaum (see John 6: 62-69), Jesus said unto the twelve, Will ye also go away? Then Simon Peter answered him, Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life; and we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God."

"Thus again at Cæsarea Philippi, Saint Peter, speaking as before in the name of the twelve, though as appears from our Lord's words with a peculiar distinctness of personal conviction, repeated that declaration, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.' . . . The early church regarded Saint Peter generally, and most especially on this occasion, as the representative of the apostolic body."

Again, Doctor Smith, in speaking of the Savior with the apostles, John 21, says, "He (Peter) then received the formal commission to feed Christ's sheep, rather as one who had forfeited his place (in denying his Lord), and could not resume it without such an authorization."—Bible Dictionary, under the heading Peter, pp. 427, 428.

The writer of the Exegesis seems to have imbibed the idea that because Peter took the lead and spoke for the twelve that he did all of their thinking and concluding; that whatever was his view the rest were bound to agree to it. But this is a grave error. No such thought is held or believed by any writer. No trace of any such thing appears. There was order. Peter was in touch with the other members of the quorum, knew their views and convictions, so on proper occasions, as the leader, he spoke for them. Each apostle retained his individuality, agency, and liberty of action.

The writer of the Exegesis goes on, as if there were some argument in it, "It is evident that the president of the

Quorum of the Twelve does not answer for his brethren of the quorum in our day. For instance the claim that James the Lord's brother was president of the ancient church, and many other things. Moreover the president of the Quorum of Apostles has no more authority or keys than any other member of the Quorum of Twelve, outside of quorum sessions, etc."

It would be interesting to learn how our critic found out all of this wisdom. Will he be so kind as to tell us who it is from and by what process it is done, that the president of the quorum receives the authority and keys when the quorum meets, and to whom they are relinquished when they disband? He does not seem to possess them out of quorum session according to this theory. Where are they during the time of adjournment from one session to another? It may be that the president leaves the authority and keys hanging on the peg where his hat hung during the session as he goes out at dismissal. This volunteered opinion we think is likely to strike people with amazement, coming from one who is essaying to put things in order.

Tired of following the subject matter in hand, it seems a new issue is raised here, *i. e.*, the question of the authority of the president of the Twelve. We are not in a very advantageous position to discuss or say much about the rights and prerogatives that inure to the office of the president of the Twelve, neither does the question properly belong here, hence this is deferred to a proper time. It might turn out, after all the returns are in, however, that the office of president of the Twelve does mean something and that the president holds some authority and prerogatives that apply outside of quorum sessions, as well as presidents of other quorums or organized bodies, and that hitherto they have not been properly recognized or anything said about them. At least we dissent from the exposition of our critic. The writer is loath to conclude that the president of the Twelve is merely a figurehead from the closing of one session to another of the quorum's meetings in his relationship to the quorum and the church. If the criticism

be true, the office might be abolished without injury to the body.

Again, "Though my statement may be absurd wherein I contend that it was James, the son of Alphæus, that continued on down after the death of James, the son of Zebedee, yet I have failed to see anything presented to prove it to the contrary." But since our critic has failed to see what is against him it will necessitate a restatement of a few things. The learned Doctor Philip Schaff says, "James the son of Alphæus—one of the twelve disciples of Jesus. He is so designated in four places,—Matthew 10: 3; Mark 3: 18; Luke 6: 15; Acts 1: 13. No other passage can with certainty be regarded as referring to him or his family, and nothing further is known definitely of his life. The alleged blood relationship of his family with the house of Jesus lacks all evidence." Again, "They are pure assumptions." "James the Just, the brother of the Lord, the head of the church at Jerusalem, is distinguished from the two apostles of the same name." "The fraternal relation reported to have existed between James and Jesus was explained as the relation between cousins. But Tertullian is a witness to the fact that the distinction between James and his apostles was still held in his day. He speaks of the consummation of Mary's marriage with Joseph after the birth of Jesus, and of the brothers of Jesus to prove the reality of the incarnation over against agnostic objections. At a somewhat later date the apostolic constitutions declared for the same view." That the fraternal relation is vouched for by another passage, "I, James, a brother of the Lord according to the flesh."—*Herald*, vol. 50, pp. 1103, 1104. But, Doctor Schaff says the first to declare himself distinctly for this identification (that James the son of Alphæus and James the Lord's brother was the same person) was "Jerome." Further, "James was, therefore, the full brother of Jesus, and a different person from the two apostles of that name." (*Herald*, vol. 50, pp. 1103, 1104.) The argument for the identification of the son of Alphæus with the brother of Jesus is "beset with insuperable difficulties." (T. K. Cheyne, M. A.,

D. D.) This same author says, "James the son of Alphæus. He also was one of the apostles, and is mentioned in all four of the lists by this name but in no other place."—*Herald*, vol. 50, p. 1079. "The son of Alphæus is only named in the four lists of apostles."—*Britannica*, vol. 13, p. 552. Does our critic see anything to the contrary? Better reread!

But objections are continued; he says: "It would hardly be supposed that those who had been preferred by our Lord and set apart by him to preside over the Melchisedec order of the priesthood and to have care of spiritual things would contend for the honors of being the bishop whose calling is to minister in temporal affairs." More cider in the cotton! The very points at issue to be proven are here assumed in this jingling of words together. It would "hardly be supposed." Of course not, for there is nothing in the assumption. It has already been shown that the most learned confess to not knowing the title of office given to James in his day, but in after years it was the custom to call the highest officer in the church, "bishop"; so historians adopted it and applied this title to James, by reading back; later writers use the term "president" to designate his office, as will be seen. Further, it is also admitted that it is not known from historical evidence the distinguishing titles of offices given to Timothy and Titus or when ordained; or when and the circumstances when presbyters were ordained. This is sufficient reference to the jugglery of words about James being one of the presidency, counselor to Peter, bishop, and Bro. Kelley looking for something to make this same person "patriarch." It is so interesting, hence our notice of it at all.

But he goes on: "We are surprised that Bro. Kelley did not quote the foot-note on page 36 of Eusebius' History." There need be no "surprise" about that. Eusebius did not write it. It is simply a foot-note put in by somebody else, most likely to make a showing that Eusebius sustains Jerome's views. It is found in the edition of the Reverend C. F. Cruse, A. M., with notes selected from the edition of Valesius as a foot-note. It is not in the edition by Isaac

Boyle, 'D. D., printed in 1869. This ought to cause all "surprise" to subside. The foot-note is an interloper.

Page 9, "Again the claim is made that James was converted and made president of the church immediately after the ascension of Christ. In three days." Who makes this claim? It is another man of straw, seemingly set up for diversion, and the writer goes on again referring to the visit to the house of Cornelius, which was exploded in our last article, in which it was shown that there was no need of a first president to do the work that Peter did at the house of Cornelius, as it was in line with Peter's calling and commission as an apostle to do that work. So there is nothing "conclusive" in that the Lord recognized Peter as at the head of the church any more than it is "conclusive" that Philip or Ananias, who were directed similarly in their work, were presidents. There is nothing singular about the transaction even if James was then the active president of the church. Peter did just what any apostle has a right to do, that is, obeyed the voice of God when in discharge of his ministerial work. It is not expected that any minister will be dictated to by the First Presidency or any one else in all that he does. The minister is free to obey God at all times.

Again if the president of the Twelve were sent to Jerusalem to preach to the Gentiles, and when he arrived there God should command him to preach to the Jews, he would not stop to hear what the First Presidency says about it, but would go right on obeying God, and as Peter did, take his chances before the church when called in question. The Presidency would not immediately recall him either. The advice and direction of the Presidency is not intended to supplant the individual freedom of a person to be guided by God's wisdom in his ministerial work. The imputation that it does smacks of rank heresy. How does the writer know that when the time comes to preach to the Jews a revelation to that effect must needs come through the First President? The preaching of the gospel was extended to the Gentiles through the ministration of an apostle at Jeru-



saalem, and this was right and proper, no matter if the country were full of first presidents. What occurred once may occur again. An apostle is a servant of God and has a right to obey his voice in his ministerial work, independent of any direction of the First Presidency. Hence there is nothing "evident" in the plea on page 10, of *Herald*, January 6, 1904.

In *Herald*, volume 51, page 29, we are referred again to the "brethren" question, which was exploded in a previous article, and Gressler, Lardner, and the Emphatic Diaglott are cited again in evidence in an effort to prove that "brethren" in the Bible means *cousins*. But if the reader will turn and read the references relied upon to support this view of Jerome the weakness of the texts will appear at once and there will be no difficulty in deciding where the truth lies. Read Genesis 26, also 29: 15. Doctor Schaff says the word *brethren* (*adelphus*, in the Greek) is never used in the New Testament of any other than the fraternal relation; and the few cases adduced from the Old Testament are indefinite, and special terms are employed for kindred and cousin."—*Herald*, vol. 50, p. 1104. On the same page it is objected that Jerome was the first writer that gave prominence to the notion that the "brethren of the Lord" were but cousins. Doctor Schaff says, "But the first to declare himself distinctly for the identification was Jerome, who wrote a work against Helvidius advocating Mary's perpetual virginity." Our critic against the Doctor.

Again, our critic has great worry because Jesus committed his mother to John's care. But Jesus calls John her son and Mary his mother. So there is no use fretting over this. It is only a question as to whether the higher spiritual union in the gospel is not stronger and more worthy of trust than the earthly, even though it was important that she be committed to the care of a natural son. At the time, her children were unbelievers. Jesus said, "For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother."—Matthew 12:50. In this high ethical and spiritual sense Jesus committed his

mother to the care of Jesus' brother, and of course the son of Mary.

But we are further criticised as follows: "The reason assigned by the opposition is that her sons were unbelievers at the time in question, and in the next breath we are told that he was converted and made president of the church immediately after the resurrection, the long space of three days," etc. How magical! But stop a moment! Who was it said the reason that Jesus committed his mother to John was that his brethren were unbelievers? Who was it said that James was converted and made president immediately after the crucifixion—in three days? It would be very interesting to know.

Again, "If Christ failed to appoint his successor previous to his crucifixion, the church on earth was without any visible head for several days." Well, that is about the history of it, unless Mary was at the head; or the apostles, —and they went fishing. Who rallied them? Was it not the stranger who journeyed to Emmaus, the true head, upon his return? The apostles were next in charge, it seems, so when tidings came that Samaria had received the word, "the apostles" sent two of their number, "Peter and John"—two of the assumed first presidency of our critic—"to Samaria, to aid the work there." But when the persecution arose about Stephen and the disciples were scattered abroad, the gospel was received at Antioch. "Then tidings of these things came unto the ears of the church which was in Jerusalem: and they sent forth Barnabas, that he should go as far as Antioch."—Acts 11:22. It appears that the church at Jerusalem was then in a comparatively organized condition and some one in charge, hence the sending of the missionary Barnabas to Antioch without his being directed by the apostles. It does appear that James was then in authority. In the next chapter is recorded the statement of Peter, "Go show these things unto James and to the brethren." So we find James fully in power and with the church caring for the churches abroad. Jesus was crucified 33 A. D. This would give between seven and ten years for

the conversion and appointment of James and a complete organization of the church with a president, and not "immediately after the crucifixion,—two or three days," and as it is admitted by all that Christ appeared to James he could easily have appointed him his successor. Christ met with the disciples often. Was seen by above five hundred at once. No trouble here. We do not "concede" either that Jude was one of the college of apostles. It will help our critic to reread Doctor Schaff's article if he is looking for light. Presidency and Priesthood holds a different view.

Yes, T. K. Cheyne, M. A., D. D., once Professor of Holy Scriptures, Oxford, "is all right." Some men are sufficiently large, capable, and free from bias as not to follow the beaten track of others, but declare for facts in any event. T. K. Cheyne seems to be of that make-up. Then if his sympathy is with Rome and Oxford traditions, he is all the better witness for us. When a man is compelled to testify perforce of facts against commonly received opinions in order to be right, he is a good witness.

Now our critic states, however, that "Eminent writers differ widely and we can not depend on what they write but must look to the Scriptures for authentic support of our ideas." Just so. Some time ago the claim was made that all the best authorities were on his side of the question. Why this change? But he will find it more difficult to get a clear statement from the Scriptures in favor of his position than from the best historians as he holds out a prominent historian that arose in the fourth century who was the cause of misleading writers and darkening counsel ever since, to fall back on. But we can get light if we will read extensively enough. Our critic apologizes by saying he used a considerable amount of historical matter simply to show that our most "eminent writers differ widely and can not be depended upon." We knew that before; this is an age of inquiry.

Again, "The effort to refute my position on lineage is far-fetched." What difference does it make just so it is "fetched"? Yes, our critic insisted strongly that the lineage

was from father to son. This was not denied, however, but there are exceptions to this general rule, which we have shown. This is the clue that spoiled the objection of our critic.

The old argument about woman's seed should bruise the serpent's head is again introduced in the criticism. But who is it that can not see that if Jesus, being begotten by the Holy Ghost, was recognized as lineal heir of the seed of David and was counted through Joseph, that a son of Mary, the father of whom was Joseph, would be counted in the same lineal line? If the real efficacy in one case comes by reason of the mother, why not the same efficacy obtain in the natural born? The evidence we adduced was from the Book of Mormon, and anything from that book to a Latter Day Saint ought not to be considered very "far-fetched"; and it was not "a hard nut to crack." However, there is not sufficient revealed on all questions to present them with desired ampleness of historical certainty that is all satisfactory. What is revealed belongs to us and our children,—the rest to God. Wrong theories lead into difficulty. Hence our critic seems to be in a maze of difficulty in following his theory.

But the criticism proceeds: "There is nowhere to be found a promise that this right might descend from mother to son." It is equally true that it is nowhere written that it could not so descend, and it is also true that Jesus was of the lineage of David and yet there was no blood of David in him but that received from his mother. If this mother's blood gave Jesus the lineal right through the seed of David manifest in his mother, why not the lineal right be recognized in the line of David through the same man and the mother of Jesus to James? Sure enough!

This is followed by a reincarnation of the old argument exploded that Peter was always "first," etc., which does not need further notice for there is nothing in it pointing to a presidency except that Peter was a leader of the twelve—one of the most active of the apostles, a man of affairs—relied upon before and after his call to the apostleship.

But we are informed; "He will find it to be quite a task to get the people to believe that the terms quorum and kingdom are synonymous." No, we would not have them believe that way. No one holds to that belief that we know of. We do not on this side of the question. Do not have to believe it.

Then follows a revamping of the assertion that Peter was the president of the conference held in Jerusalem, recorded in Acts 15. It is sufficient comment on this to say that we know of no author who supports the position. All agree that James was president of that assembly. In Latter Day Saint belief the highest in authority presides always. We are sorry that our friend persists in arraying himself against all historical evidences that are at hand upon this question which we have seen, no matter which side of the main question they were on.

Our critic's "summary" is too funny to extend this article further in examining. Those who have not, should read it. We are loath to express an opinion. The reference given about what Hegissippus says about what Hegesseppus said we have not been able to find, so can not pass upon it in its true light. At best it would be but a statement of what one writer says another wrote at an early day which has no confirmation. It might properly be questioned, however, by us, for the spirit of apostasy and the introduction of false views began at an early day in the church, so that after the deaths of the apostles and first witnesses, there was talk and conjuring of things to fix up the growing apostate belief to keep Mary "ever virgin"; and the "brethren of Jesus" standing in the way, there would be speculation and theories invented and talked of to get them out of the way. This would be natural. But as shown in this article, Jerome was the man that introduced distinctly this theory into history which has been followed largely since, until of recent years the learned are exploding the old misleading fancy along with other errors that crept up under Roman Catholic formation and rule, and the truth about the fraternal relations of Joseph and Mary are brought to light.

It will be observed that a president has been maintained for the ancient Jerusalem church; and that this was James the Lord's brother. That his seat was at Jerusalem, and that he presided over the church at home and abroad. That he did not belong to the college of apostles. That he had two assistants or counselors, who may have been Jude and Silas, though this is not conclusive. That the Roman Catholic claim and tradition that the "brethren" of Jesus, Matthew 13: 55, means that they were his cousins, is a fake. That the right of the presidency in the priesthood and succession belonged to the house of Joseph and not to the house of Zebedee; that Peter never was the president of the church, nor a pope; that this claim for Peter is another fake: a false position whether held to by Latter Day Saints, Roman Catholics, or protestants. That after the crucifixion and ascension of the Lord, the twelve apostles were in complete charge for a time, and then there were called into office, deacons, elders, bishops, and a presidency within the space of about seven or ten years. Each occupied specific places in the organizations assigned; the president and apostles acting together and supervising the work at home and abroad. That the twelve apostles lived and died occupying the identical office to which Jesus called and assigned them, and that in the millennium, or when his kingdom shall rule on earth, they will hold these separate and distinct offices as his prime ministers, and "set on thrones." That Peter, James, and John were made special witnesses and leaders because of a peculiar personal fitness belonging to them, which was recognized by the Savior on their first acquaintance; but that they never were constituted a presidency of of the church either as men or angels. Peter was a leader by nature and had charge of men and a business when Jesus first met him. John was dearly beloved because of natural endowments belonging to him, and James was a strong, devoted character upon whom the people relied, hence, were made the chief witnesses for Christ.

While writing Presidency and Priesthood, it was not designed to use text-books in support of the positions assumed

other than the Bible and secular history; but the criticisms advanced have been based chiefly on Latter Day Saint sayings and revealments, so it became necessary to refer to these in making this reply, and also necessitates an enlargement of the volume.

This article or reply has been in readiness for over twelve months, but was held up, it would seem, on the ground that it was producing controversy and inquiry, causing people to think, a false sentiment having crept in which is at variance with the spirit and genius of the Reorganized Church from its inception, and of the ancient Jerusalem church, that it is wrong to examine into and discuss a matter of religious belief in order to arrive at an intelligent conclusion in regard to it. In the midst of research and comparison of views—search for light, some one cries out, "There is contention—a lack of unity, it weakens the faith of members," etc. So the doors of free inquiry and discussion are closed, and ignorance is enthroned as the mother of unity and devotion, while the best means known to human experience to arrive at a desired unity, that of inquiry and discussion, is ruled out. It would be highly interesting, however, to see a body of people come to a unity concerning some important matter of which they were wholly ignorant and refused to inform themselves,—just standing around with their hands in their pockets waiting for unity, or the dictation of some accepted boss, and finding fault with people who are delving into the facts and bringing them to light.

Salt Lake furnishes a splendid ideal of a unity reached in this "down with controversy" way. Russia is another example. There is a wide difference between discussion and a proper inquiry into a matter in order to ascertain the truth of it, and wrangling contentions.

Unless our critics can bring something new and much more in point and potency in the way of evidence and argument than anything yet seen from that side, this will conclude our articles on the question. We have no disposition to bicker over words and phrases to no purpose or strive for

mere mastery. All readers among Latter Day Saints should be benefited by this investigation. The doctrine, "Prove all things, hold fast that which is good," applies to this as well as other questions. When Latter Day Saints are asked to assign a reason for their belief, if they are not conversant with the reasons they can not assign them, but will have to remain mute when interrogated. Both sides in this inquiry believe in a president, but the question is, Who was he?

Personally, with the writer it is no matter who he was, but from the evidence in sight, James, the brother of Jesus, stands, "beyond question," the president. Do not get a wrong idea of what is meant by the phrase "beyond question." In a sense anything can be questioned. We have heard it questioned that there ever lived such a man as Shakespeare, of the existence of the souls of men; of hell; of God; of heaven; and of the Devil. What we mean is, that the evidence in the Bible and history strongly preponderates in making it reasonably certain that James was the president of the Jerusalem church. There is nothing for Peter;—not a line. If the author of the "Exegesis" will furnish a single text of clear statement from the New Testament or reliable history that Peter was ever appointed to be, or acted as the president of the church, the writer of this will take pleasure in seeing that he is amply rewarded for his new discovery.

This reply will be added to the answers of the other criticisms made and put in pamphlet form, so that those who wish can examine and compare at their leisure; and it will also appear in the future editions of Presidency and Priesthood.

WM. H. KELLEY.

LAMONI, Iowa, June 20, 1905.



REV. F. C. ELLIS, CUM



# INDEX.

---

## A

Antiquity of the priesthood . . . . .	3
Antiquity of the Gospel . . . . .	7, 10
Abraham and Melchisedec . . . . .	14
Aaronic priesthood held by John the Baptist . . . . .	15
Antiquity of high priests . . . . .	22
Authorization of ministry . . . . .	23, 25, 43
Aaronic priesthood changeable . . . . .	32
Apostles appoint seven to serve tables . . . . .	37
Apostles and prophets, continuation of . . . . .	47, 295
Apostles ordained James . . . . .	81
Apostasy of the church . . . . .	87, 294
Ancient churches compared with modern ones . . . . .	97, 98
Anabaptists . . . . .	144, 149, 150
Asbury, Bishop . . . . .	163
Anthon, Prof. . . . .	293
Archbishops . . . . .	296
Apostles' Creed . . . . .	303
Alexander, Pope, crowned head . . . . .	325
Appease the Deity by whipping themselves . . . . .	325
Arrogant claims of papal church . . . . .	326
All human power is from evil . . . . .	327
Admonishing and punishment given by popes . . . . .	328
Apostles and patriarchs . . . . .	334
Awful pictures of popedom . . . . .	340
Apostates murdered . . . . .	348
Abraham Lincoln's assassin was a Catholic . . . . .	348
Auricular confession, means of salvation . . . . .	352
Advice of Luther to Landgrave of Hesse, on his second marriage . . . . .	359
Anabaptist had many wives . . . . .	360
Augustine on the laying on of hands . . . . .	372

## B

Bishop and elder . . . . .	42, 295
Bingham on James, president . . . . .	81
Baptist Church in America . . . . .	109

# INDEX.

Buck . . . . .	113, 114, 117, 144
Baptist denomination . . . . .	123, 357
Buckland, R. J. W. . . . .	128
Baptist principles discussed . . . . .	137, 144
Baptists persecute . . . . .	144, 146
Bossuet, J. B. . . . .	149, 150
Book of Mormon . . . . .	293, 373
Bishop of Rome . . . . .	297, 308
Boniface . . . . .	302, 310, 311
Bible societies . . . . .	334
Brownson says about Catholics . . . . .	337
Books for Catholics in schools . . . . .	340
Blessing of the priest for confessors . . . . .	353
Bruces . . . . .	358, 361
Baptism . . . . .	363
Beza on baptism . . . . .	364
Brenner on baptism . . . . .	364
Bretschneider on baptism . . . . .	364
Bloomfield on baptism . . . . .	366
Bingham on baptism . . . . .	368

## C

Christian church containing both priesthoods . . . . .	17, 35, 40, 41
Changeableness of priesthood . . . . .	30, 32
Chief apostle and high priest . . . . .	51
Counsellors to president, two . . . . .	67
Church of Rev. xii. . . . .	85
Campbell, Alex. . . . .	95, 182
Corinthians, Chap. xiii., explained . . . . .	100
Conscience not a safe guide . . . . .	102, 105
Church, Lutheran . . . . .	111
Calvinists . . . . .	113
Church, Presbyterian . . . . .	116
Creed, Presbyterian . . . . .	118, 121
Church, Episcopalian . . . . .	120, 356
Cobbett's letters : . . . .	122, 152
Church, Baptist . . . . .	123
Church of Christ compared with Baptist . . . . .	133
Cyclopedia, People's . . . . .	151
Comber, Dr. . . . .	152
Church, Catholic . . . . .	154
Church, Methodist . . . . .	137
Coke, Dr. . . . .	162
Church, Congregational . . . . .	166
Church, Disciple . . . . .	172
Capel, Monsignor . . . . .	160
Churches . . . . .	295, 299, 310, 311
Clergy and creed . . . . .	303, 327
Constantine professed conversion . . . . .	296, 297

# INDEX.

Canons . . . . .	296
Constantinople seat of civilization . . . . .	298
Council of Chalcedon . . . . .	298
Church and state . . . . .	300
Christian priests . . . . .	303
Consult pope in temporal matters . . . . .	304
Cross the Alps in winter . . . . .	305
Covered with vermin . . . . .	308
Crusaders . . . . .	314
Confirmed by the pope . . . . .	329
Church not to be established except by pope . . . . .	328
Catholic Church first, and state next . . . . .	331
Cardinal Manning on popish power . . . . .	331
Character of popes . . . . .	341
Cursing all of them, popes . . . . .	342
Confession to be made by Catholic . . . . .	354
Calvin on baptism . . . . .	367, 368
Charles Anthon on baptism . . . . .	369
Chambers on infant baptism . . . . .	370
Curcellæus on infant baptism . . . . .	370
Cyprian on the laying on of hands . . . . .	371, 372
Correspondence of Smith and Rice . . . . .	374, 375
Copy of Mr. Rice's letter . . . . .	378

## D

Definition of priesthood . . . . .	1
Definition between priesthoods . . . . .	13
Divine call to priestly office . . . . .	21
Doctrines fundamental . . . . .	83
Declension of the church . . . . .	87
Disciple Church . . . . .	172
Detector . . . . .	49
Due bishop of Constantinople . . . . .	298
Dowling says . . . . .	301
Dark ages . . . . .	301
Dominican and Franciscan orders . . . . .	314
Decree of Pope Innocent III. . . . .	314
Divine inspiration . . . . .	327
Damned to die by pope . . . . .	335
Dislike of Protestant children, taught it . . . . .	346
Dublin mass . . . . .	347
Disobedience to be stopped by hanging by neck . . . . .	357
Deming, A. B., wanted Spaulding romance . . . . .	376

## E

Elias, John Baptist . . . . .	20
Encyclopædia on James as president . . . . .	79
Eusebius on James, president . . . . .	79

# INDEX.

Eusebius, grandchildren of Judas . . . . .	2, 81
Episcopalians . . . . .	120, 295
Encyclopædia Britannica . . . . .	171
Exarchs . . . . .	296
Emperor . . . . .	296, 300, 302
Eastern churches . . . . .	300
Elements of letters . . . . .	301
Edwin D. Mead, of Boston . . . . .	321
Education an American hobby . . . . .	343
Epictetus on baptism . . . . .	366
Eusebius on laying on of hands . . . . .	371
E. L. Kelley, letter to W. W. Blair on manuscript . . . . .	379

## F

First principles of the Gospel . . . . .	9
Friends or Quakers . . . . .	164
Fox, George . . . . .	165
Fifteenth century . . . . .	301
France governed by Pepin . . . . .	303
Fathers of the church . . . . .	304
Fasts and feasts . . . . .	305
Funeral solemnity not allowed . . . . .	306
Familiars or Inquisition . . . . .	314
Fagots tied up with ribbons . . . . .	316
Forms of blessing in bestowing indulgences . . . . .	318
Famous Jubilee . . . . .	325
Filthy concubines . . . . .	333
Father cures him . . . . .	335
Free public school system go to the devil . . . . .	340
Fuller, Richard, on baptism . . . . .	365

## G

Gospel administered by authority of priesthood . . . . .	5
Gospel antiquity . . . . .	7, 10
Gospel, first principles . . . . .	9
German emperors . . . . .	304
God's gifts, indulgences . . . . .	319
Gladstone says . . . . .	325
Govern the people, or all is lost to Catholicism . . . . .	337
Gregory the Great . . . . .	341, 348

## H

High priest continueth ever . . . . .	54
Hegesippus on James as president . . . . .	65
Hording, D. D., Rev. J. W., on James . . . . .	79, 117
Howard Osgood, Prof. . . . .	130
Harris, Mr. . . . .	293

# INDEX.

Hildebrand, Gregory VII.	305
Henry II., king of England, walks barefoot	305
He who kills a non-Catholic is no murderer legally	328
Hecker, Father, says America will receive Catholicism	332
Holy Bible a detestable thing	333
Horrible vats wherein men perished alive	339
Hogan, Wm., says of Catholics	347
Henry VIII., England cannot be proud of	357
Hospinianus on baptism	364
Hyde, Rev. Dr., written on manuscript	377

## I

Institutions of Moses similar to that of Christ	53
Institution of Moses and Christ	82, 83
Inspired ministers to continue in the Christian church	99
Ignorance of the clergy	301
Indulgences sold	308, 317, 323, 324, 325, 338, 347, 355
Inquisition	311, 312, 315, 316, 317, 323, 334, 339, 347
Infalibility of popes	342
Ignorance brings order, says Catholics	343
Illustration of what Catholics have done	344
Image worship as means of salvation	349, 350
Immaculate conception of Virgin Mary	351, 352

## J

John Baptist a priest	18
John Baptist the Elias	20
Jesus called to the priesthood	52
James, the Lord's brother, president of the church	58
James president—Hegesippus	65
James president—Bingham	65
James president—Pictorial Bible	66
James appointed to an office in the priesthood	66
Jude and Judas, counsellors	70, 71
Jerome on ordination of James	81
Jones's church history	94
Jones, L. G.	124
Johnson, J. T.	173
Judaism	313
John Tetzl, pedler of indulgences	319
John XII., name changed when chosen to the papacy	326
John Huss burned	342
Jesuits' society and oaths	344
Josephus on baptism	365
John Wesley on baptism	367, 368
James H. Fairchild's letter	379

# INDEX.

## K

Kingdom of God taken from Jews . . . . .	36
Keys conferred upon Peter, James, and John, as ministers to all nations . . . . .	77
Keys . . . . .	298, 310, 317
Kings dethroned by popes . . . . .	303
Kill him — John, king of England . . . . .	306
Kingdom not of this world . . . . .	310
Kings have no jurisdiction over popes . . . . .	330

## L

Laws of initiation into the church . . . . .	84
Lutheran Church . . . . .	111
Lincoln, Heman . . . . .	127
Leo Great . . . . .	298, 317, 322
Lord's supper . . . . .	306
Luther, Martin . . . . .	320, 358, 361
Leroy M. Vernon says of Romanism . . . . .	327
Liberty of conscience not allowed by pope . . . . .	340, 341
Lost forever because not a Catholic . . . . .	345
Limbo part of hell . . . . .	355
Luther on baptism . . . . .	364
Luther on infant baptism . . . . .	370

## M

Melchisedec priesthood authority for administering the Gospel . . . . .	5
Moses held higher priesthood . . . . .	13
Melchisedec and Aaronic priesthood in the Christian church . . . . .	17, 35
Melchisedec priesthood unchangeable . . . . .	30
Moses and the seventy elders . . . . .	39
Mosheim's history . . . . .	93, 300
Marsh's history . . . . .	91, 164
Miller, V. S. . . . .	120
Mitchell, Dr. . . . .	293
Man of Sin . . . . .	294, 304, 356
Make me bishop . . . . .	297
Middle Ages . . . . .	301
Midnight . . . . .	301
Money wanted by bishops . . . . .	307, 319, 325
Mary, mother of God . . . . .	319, 349, 352
Mother of harlots . . . . .	325, 345
Monsignor Capel said in New York . . . . .	338, 339
Murder permitted by pope . . . . .	348
Moses, respect to marriage . . . . .	361



# INDEX.

Marriage, contract of, Philip Landgrave . . . . .	362
Mosheim on baptism . . . . .	368
M. De la Roque on infant baptism . . . . .	369
Mosheim on laying on of hands . . . . .	372
Manuscript could not be found . . . . .	373

## N

New kingdom . . . . .	33
Northrop, Geo. W. . . . .	129
Naked body . . . . .	305
No taper lighted or divine service . . . . .	306
No indulgences sold . . . . .	348
Neander on infant baptism . . . . .	370

## O

Office of priesthood cannot be assumed at will . . . . .	16
Order of offices in priesthood . . . . .	42, 43, 45
Office of chief apostle and high priest . . . . .	51, 55
Office of twelve apostles not the highest . . . . .	54
Order was terrible . . . . .	307
Our Lord God the pope . . . . .	334
Oath of allegiance . . . . .	338
Oath and deny adultery or any crime . . . . .	338, 339
Olshausen on baptism . . . . .	366

## P

Priesthood defined . . . . .	1
Priesthood, Aaronic and Melchisedec . . . . .	4
Priesthood with Israelites . . . . .	12
Priesthood, predictions concerning . . . . .	27
Priesthood in Christian church . . . . .	17, 35, 40, 41
Privileges of house of God . . . . .	40
Pictorial Bible on Jude . . . . .	71
Peter not the president . . . . .	72
Peter, president of college of apostles . . . . .	73
Presidency and twelve associated . . . . .	74
Priesthood lineal . . . . .	78
Primitive church, Rev. xii. . . . .	85
Presbyterians . . . . .	116
Persecutions, Baptist . . . . .	144, 146
Protestants excommunicated . . . . .	155
Priesthood and succession . . . . .	160
Puritans . . . . .	171
Priesthood, John Wesley . . . . .	159
Presbyter . . . . .	295
Patriarchs . . . . .	296
Prebendaries . . . . .	296
Political consequence . . . . .	299

# INDEX.

Peter I., bishop of Rome . . . . .	269
Popes supreme judges . . . . . 300, 302, 306, 308, 322, 329, 330	300, 302, 306, 308, 322, 329, 330
Phocas, Emperor . . . . .	302
Popery, or the religion of the pope . . . . .	302
Priests, corrupt . . . . .	303, 347
Pepin, papal decision . . . . .	304
Proper history of papacy begins . . . . .	304
Priests, double portion . . . . .	306
Price lists for the privilege of sinning . . . . .	318
Purgatory releases her subjects for money . . . . .	320
Prostitution encouraged by popes . . . . .	324
Pope Joan a woman . . . . .	326
Pope has rights to countries to whom he wills . . . . .	327
Pope has right to annul state laws . . . . .	327
Pius IX. . . . .	328
Prince Bismarck on Italian pope . . . . .	329
Pope cursings and awful denunciations . . . . . 334, 335, 336	334, 335, 336
Public schools to be avoided by Catholics . . . . .	340
Protestantism cannot be trusted . . . . . 341, 344, 345	341, 344, 345
Peter's, St., keys . . . . .	342
Pastors allowed to do things laity are not . . . . .	343
Protestants might learn meekness . . . . .	347
Priest tells what people confess to in confession . . . . .	353
Protestant churches . . . . .	362
Prof. Stuart on baptism . . . . .	366

## R

Royal priesthood . . . . .	26
Right of the first born . . . . .	78
Reformation . . . . .	106, 110
Rowlin, A. . . . .	108
Rupp, D. . . . .	117, 148, 162
Ray, D. B. . . . .	137
Roman bishops . . . . .	300
Roman supremacy over all earth . . . . .	304
Radbert, Paschasius . . . . .	306
Remission of sins purchased . . . . .	307
Rover show of relics of saints . . . . .	308
Romish system developed . . . . . 309, 331, 341	309, 331, 341
Roman Catholics against Swinton's History . . . . .	320
Roderic Borgia, Pope Alexander VI. . . . .	324
Roman clergy destroy America . . . . .	326, 332
Rosary, a string of beads . . . . .	326, 352
Rome requires converts who join her to forfeit morals and mental freedom . . . . .	329
Romish Church and authority . . . . . 333, 336, 337, 339, 340	333, 336, 337, 339, 340
Reasons why Protestants cannot be saved . . . . .	346
Rheinard on sprinkling . . . . .	365
Rosenmüller on baptism . . . . .	366

# INDEX.

## S

Smith, Dr. Wm., on James as president . . . . .	63, 64
Smith, Dr. Wm., on Peter . . . . .	73
Stone, Barton W. . . . .	97, 173, 174
Sects not organized like the ancient Christian church . . . . .	101
Smith, Dr. Wm. . . . .	108
Schmucker . . . . .	112
Schaff, Philip . . . . .	115, 118, 119
Succession, Baptist . . . . .	127, 130
Simon, Menno . . . . .	144
Scientific disclosures . . . . .	293
Second century . . . . .	295
Successor . . . . .	298
Superiority of rank . . . . .	299
Sixth century . . . . .	300
Set himself above all law, human or divine . . . . .	305
Support of papacy . . . . .	307
Sacerdotal pretension to its highest . . . . .	309
Slavery for non-Catholic . . . . .	327
State has the right to say what a man's religion shall be, . . . . .	328, 329
Schools, public, governed by the pope . . . . .	329
Sixteenth century. Catholic Church predominant . . . . .	330
Submit in all things is Catholic faith . . . . .	330
Salvation depends on submission to pope . . . . .	332
School system of United States go to the devil where it came from . . . . .	340
Some men born to lead, others to be led . . . . .	343
Sunday-School Manual, Catholic text-book . . . . .	354
Secrecy of Landgrave scheme advised by Luther . . . . .	359, 361
Second wife . . . . .	359
Salmasius on baptism by immersion . . . . .	364, 368
Scholtz, baptism consists of immersion . . . . .	365
Smith in Dictionary of the Bible, on baptism . . . . .	369
Stark's History of Baptism . . . . .	369

## T

Testimony of the fathers . . . . .	28
Timothy and Titus, no distinctive title . . . . .	64, 65
Thrall . . . . .	108
Tertullian says . . . . .	294
The little horn . . . . .	304
Thomas à Becket, Archbishop . . . . .	305
Transubstantiation . . . . .	306, 309
Twelfth century . . . . .	307, 312
Thirteenth century . . . . .	308
Tertullian on baptism . . . . .	368
Tertullian on laying on of hands . . . . .	370

# INDEX.

## U

Unchangeability of priesthood . . . . .	30
Uninstructed . . . . .	301
Universal bishop . . . . .	302
Use the title . . . . .	302
Universal Father . . . . .	305
Unom Sanctum . . . . .	310
United States ere long receive Catholicism . . . . .	332
Unitarians . . . . .	358

## V

Virgin Mary . . . . .	306, 313, 334
Various orders and ranks . . . . .	307
Vicar of God . . . . .	325
Vicar of Christ . . . . .	331
View Roman Catholic takes of an oath . . . . .	337
Views of eminent authors on baptism . . . . .	364
Vitrunga on baptism by immersion . . . . .	364, 367
Venema on baptism . . . . .	367

## W

Waddington . . . . .	94, 150, 295, 311, 324
Wesley, John . . . . .	95, 157
Williams, Wm. . . . .	128
Weston, D. . . . .	130
Williams, Roger . . . . .	150, 153
Walsh, S. H. . . . .	151
Whately . . . . .	152
Watson, Richard . . . . .	158, 160
Wesley, authority of . . . . .	159
Wealth . . . . .	296
Western Roman Empire . . . . .	301
Word <i>pope</i> comes from Greek <i>papa</i> . . . . .	303
Whip his bare back to please the pope . . . . .	305
Wafer real body of Christ . . . . .	306
Wycliffe on heresy . . . . .	322
Woman in papal chair . . . . .	326
What L. L. Rice says about manuscript . . . . .	376

## Z

Zachariah a priest . . . . .	19
Zebedee and Joseph, house . . . . .	78













